

THE PROTESTANT

Edited by KENNETH LESLIE

Editorial Advisers

JAMES L. ADAMS
JOSEPH BRAININ

H. RUTLEDGE SOUTHWORTH
PIERRE VAN PAASSEN

Editorial Advisers

RUTH NANDA ANSHEN
RUSSELL C. BARBOUR
G. A. BORGESE
DWIGHT J. BRADLEY
JAMES A. BRAY
W. ELLIS DAVIES
JEROME DAVIS
MARK A. DAWBER
FREDERICK M. ELIOT
JOSEPH F. FLETCHER
J. M. FREEMAN
STEPHEN H. FRITCHMAN
ERNEST GRAHAM GUTHRIE
JOSEPH HAROUTUNIAN
CHESTER E. HODGSON
WALTER M. HORTON
EDWIN H. HUGHES
HEWLETT JOHNSON

JOHN A. LEE
DAVID LORD
DONALD LOTHROP
J. A. MACCALLUM
JOHN A. MACKAY
JOHN MACMURRAY
CLIFTON MACON
H. D. A. MAJOR
FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL
CONRAD H. MOEHLMAN
JAMES MOFFATT
JOSEPH G. MOORE
KAREN MORLEY
LOUIE D. NEWTON
ROBERT H. NICHOLS
EDWARD L. PARSONS
WILHELM PAUCK
EDWIN MCN. POTEAT

GORDON POTEAT
A. CLAYTON POWELL
LEONHARD RAGAZ
BEN RICHARDSON
LESLIE ROBERTS
RAYMOND ROBINS
W. S. RYCROFT
D. R. SHARPE
ALVA TAYLOR
WATSON THOMSON
PAUL TILlich
CHANNING H. TOBIAS
GREGORY VLASTOS
O. WALTER WAGNER
RUFUS W. WEAVER
ROBERT WHITAKER
HENRY N. WIEMAN
CLAUDE WILLIAMS

VOL. V

JANUARY, 1944

No. 5

RELIGION IS POLITICS

Editorial by PIERRE van PAASSEN

*—And Jacob awaked out of his sleep, and he said, surely,
the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not.*

Shortly before Leonhard Ragaz* laid down his theological professorship in the University of Zurich, he scandalized the good Christian people of Switzerland not a little by saying one Sunday evening from Zwingli's old pulpit in the *Muenster Kirche* that the struggle of the Prophets of Israel and of Jesus himself had been a struggle not *for* but *against* religion as men had organized it. For what did they aim at—Jesus and the Prophets? What did they envisage and want? Not a religious institution surely, said Ragaz, not temples and creeds, not priests and liturgies, not mystic twilight, candles, incense, solemn sonorities, not sacramental magic and doctrines, but something real and positive, something men could touch and put their hands on and work at, something tangible and definite.

They wanted what they called in their Hebraic idiom: *Malkut Shaddai*, the Kingdom of God. This expression which was as plainly comprehensible to Jesus' contemporaries as the term New Deal is to us today, but which in the

* Member of the Board of Editorial Advisers of THE PROTESTANT, one of the most influential figures in the Religious Socialist Movement in Europe. Ed.

course of time has taken on an aura and significance of almost ghostly other-worldliness meant a general state of human affairs bearing the divine imprint; a condition of human relationships, individual, national and international, wherein the divine principle is the paramount directive: God's rule over the world and over all the manifestations of the collective life; in other words, a world of justice and goodness.

This is the line on which Jesus stood and which he, as the Prophets before and since his day, followed to the bitter end. He wanted a Kingdom, a field of operation for God's spirit, a new world order, a new creation. The old era had come to a close, a new aeon had begun. The Prophets and Jesus wanted God drawn into human affairs. "O, that thou wouldest rend the heavens; o, that thou wouldest come down!" They wanted a new justice, the liberation of the human brother from want and fear, from violence and oppression, from Mammonism, from the wheel of despair, the *fatum horribile* of antiquity, liberation from sin and death, from the status quo and from . . . ecclesiasticism.

A learned doctor once said that the Catholic Church is not invisible (as the Protestants aver of the true church) but that it is as visible and tangible as the Kingdom of France or the Venetian Republic. This applies even more strikingly to the Kingdom of God. What Jesus and the Prophets wanted was a world order in which God would not figure as a mere passive onlooker, as an abstract principle, but wherein He was recognized and acknowledged as an active participant as builder, organizer and ruler. They had in mind a tangible, realistic social order, not a mere theory about life, either on this or on the other side of the grave, not merely a doctrinal speculation about God, not a religion.

There is not a trace of glimmer of theological doctrine in the Master's words and doings. In fact till this day it remains one of the sorest preoccupations and regrets of our theologians and philosophers that Jesus concerned himself so little with laying down his message and aspirations in more precise terms and in more scientific theological formulae. It is such a pity that he could not have gone to school a little longer—and at a better place than that Cheder which most probably existed in the Nazareth of his youth—to acquire at least the rudiments of systematic theology. Had he been only a little more considerate and taken the trouble to jot down just a few statistics, but a few ordinances, the outline of a few doctrines, how much heartbreak and worry would our theologians have been spared! Then they would have had a perfect "religion," ready to hand, conveniently divided into chapters, paragraphs, and sections, cut and dried, like a lawbook or an infantry manual.

His carelessness in this respect would be truly exasperating, if not flippant and even recklessly irresponsible were it not that Jesus did not take theology and doctrine and theories about God very seriously. He smiled over them when they were mentioned in his presence as over *une quantite negligeeable*. No, there is evidence that he actually treated them with contempt because he abhorred them.

As a Jew of the prophetic school of thought, his God was so perfectly comprehensible and self-evident to Jesus that all laborious definitions were superfluous to him and that he did not need to bother with theories. His God was

to him as every human soul sees Him and understands Him the moment God is stripped of the veils with which human wisdom and theology and religion have enveloped Him.

Jesus had no need of the paraphernalia of religion to serve his God. God was to be loved, as Moses and Isaiah and Hillel had phrased it: with all one's heart, with all one's mind and with all one's strength, that is to say with a passionate intensity of feeling, at all times and under all circumstances.

How was that to be done? How love and serve the Unseen, the Unknowable, the Unseizable? Would prayers please Him? Could He be approached in the smoke of sacrificial altars, by psalmsinging, genuflections, by fasting, meditation and symbolic gestures of filial piety and affection? What good was all that when God had said: "I abhor your feasts and solemn assemblies! Away from me with the noise of your hymns! I refuse to smell the sweet odor of your sacrifices nor will I listen to the sound of your lutes and harps! Of what value are these matters when there is lacking one thing: that justice flows as smoothly as water and righteousness as an ever-flowing, unimpeded stream?"

To serve that God no cult is necessary. To such a God ritual is anathema, nauseous, distasteful, without any point. He can be approached and loved and served only in the application of justice in human affairs, in concrete and definite circumstances and cases, in every day human relationships, in worldly business, in the hiring of laborers, in the treatment of the stranger, in a man's attitude towards children, towards widows and orphans, towards the distressed, the disinherited, the weary and heavy laden, in dealings with a neighboring people, that is: in the family, in the clan, in the community, in the nation, in the social order.

Seek first the Kingdom of God, said Jesus. Serve justice, no matter who the victims of injustice may be, whether publicans, peasants, children, aliens, the social outcasts—that is to serve God. The mummery and the sermons, the ceremonies, pomp, circumstance and respectability of religion, even prayers and fasting and guilty chestpounding become meaningless, tinkling cymbals, empty, hollow, abominable and sinful, when there is no justice. With Jesus it is not a question of saying, of singing, sighing or even of piously shouting: "Lord, Lord!" Essential is only to do the will of the Father that is in heaven, be it without mentioning His Name. God is where He rules, where justice prevails, only there.

To do: with all one's heart, with all one's mind and with all one's strength, that is to say no matter how difficult, no matter what people say about it, no matter how much they fume and rage and slander or jeer, no matter whether Caesar wants the very opposite or whether Caesar (who, incidentally, is also to render unto God what is God's) would prefer to leave things as they are; no matter whether a cross looms at the end of the road: do the will of the Father with all your heart and mind and strength, till the last ounce of your physical energy like Isaiah and Jeremiah and Akiba and Jesus and Francis and Savonarola and Huss and Servetus and Ragaz, till they squeeze the last breath out of your body in concentration camp or smother you by their lies. . . .

* * *

What a tremendous thing when a man can say right in the face of the mighty of the earth: Diametrically at variance with his own personal interests

and profit: here I stand in the Name of God! You may rail at me as a fool and a maniac, as a stutterer and devil-possessed lunatic. You may laugh me away with your scorn and pity. You may lock me up as a dangerous revolutionary, you may take my goods, my honor, my life. Nevertheless, here I stand, in the Name of God!

I did not will this. I did not seek this. I tried to evade it and escape it. I rejected it as insane pride that I, a mere man, should venture to speak of God's greatness, of His right over us, over the earth and all that's in it. Send another, said Moses, let another speak; my brother Aaron, for instance. For I have no understanding and besides Thou hast tied my tongue. I will be turned to derision and with me Thine own business. Thy kingdom will be turned into a laughing stock. Send another. I am fearful. I am afraid of the censor. I am incapable. I am weak. I have other things to do. I can praise Thy Name in other ways. I can go into a cloister, in an ivory tower, meditate upon Thy Law night and day. Leave me to my own devices. . . .

"O, Lord, Thou art stronger than I, and has prevailed!" Thou wouldst not let me go. Thy Voice was a searing fire and a whip! Thou didst surround me and overwhelm me and cut off my escape. Thou didst beat me into line!

You would not seek Me, saith the Lord, if you had not already found Me.

The obscene curse of the Negro sitting in his Jim Crow car, that was Thy Voice, o God. I caught Thee redhanded setting fire to the churches in Spain. That was Thy handiwork: the Popular Front of France and the Communes of the Catholic Basqueland. The thunder of the Russian Revolution is Thy Word taking on flesh. The weary and accusing eyes of the Jews driven forth upon Christendom's highways are Thine eyes. The millions of Red soldiers fighting, dying—that is Thine atonement for our sins, our sins of appeasement, pusillanimity, cowardice and pimping for injustice. . . .

"I was stupid as a beast and had no understanding . . . until I came into Thy sanctuary," in every day life. "Then I understood."

God, you work with the hands of all and you run with the feet of all.

Here I stand, in God's Name!

All things bear His token: the flower in the field is the work of His fingers. The stars in the deep nocturnal sky revolve around His glory. Man is the creature that can praise and serve Him only with and by his actions and deeds. Wist ye not that He works eternally in the perfection of His creation?

In man's heart He lights the fire. His spirit drives man on to serve justice on earth, to proclaim peace among the nations, to found a brotherly communion as a house wherein the Eternal may dwell. Are not the millions of the poor and dispossessed, the outcasts and disinherited your brothers? How can you live and breathe and name the Name of God and at the same time neglect justice which is the reflection of God among men?

Here I stand—in the Name of God! You who feed and clothe yourselves with the sufferings of the poor; who enrich yourselves with the famine of Hindus; you who thrive on Jew-hatred and on contradictions and conflicts amongst the children of man; you who set up scapegoats in Negroes and aliens; you who throw the peoples into war for oil, for markets; you, who prolong wars for the preservation of cartels; you who create artificial tensions between

nations by whispering and blaring lies in your press and pulpits; you who fabricate *cordons sanitaires* now by violence then by flattering hypocrisy around Russia; you who refuse the martyrs of Israel a home of their own to keep them wanderers for ever so that your doctrines might be upheld; you who refuse China the means to liberate herself because you want to turn China back into a market; you who exploit the world with the slavery of money and who proclaim your power democratic, sacrosanct and untouchable, against you I preach the Revolution of Jesus Christ, the holy Revolution of Love. I will not rest till the people are awakened; till they know that your religion is opium; till they know that anti-Semitism is not Hitler's invention but an instrument of power politics in the hands of big business and its allies the Vatican and our own Protestant Church, till they know that their children are sacrificed in each generation in holocausts to the idols of Mammon and Moloch.

And if I go forth to fight and die, then I will yet preach the Holy Revolution of Jesus Christ: People fight yourselves free. The fire of God burns and His flames are the flames of freedom!

What a tremendous thing when a man can say honestly: here I stand, in the Name of God!

In despair, in poverty of language, bereft of friends, in anguish and downfall and pain, yet in the Name of God.

* * *

To use a word of Gottfried Keller: Jesus' God stood forth, blazing in worldliness. As He revealed Himself in every day life, thus He was to be served in every day life. Jesus did not pursue some mystical power apart from or separated from the general life. His God stood squarely in the midst of life, manifested in a hundred different worldly forms and problems. There was no mystery about God, nothing artificial. He was at all times genuine and specific, visible and tangible, human. Human and divine; human because divine, divine because human.

Israel's woe, the nation in Roman bondage—that was God's wounds. The rule of Caesar Imperator—that was the nostalgic exile of the Schechina, God's glory. The multitudes without shepherds and leadership, frustrated, in poverty, in chains spiritual and material that was God's anguish, which moved the Master to innerly compassion. One man, one soul finding the way back, that was God's joy and a signal for handclapping in heaven.

The Kingdom of God, proclaimed in the Bible, in contradistinction from theology and philosophy, is not a theory, a fixed system or an established institution. It is a movement, a creative, pushing, generating force. It is history on the march. It is everyday reality, not an idea, and it is an earthly, worldly reality at that. The movement consists in the renewal of the world in and through God, by tensions and paradoxes, by struggle and protest, by man's self-sacrifice and his thirst for righteousness, by human ordinances and directives of justice, purity and goodness. The Kingdom of God is visible and tangible, in one word: it is political through and through.

Politics are an all-embracing element of modern life. Politics are the mode and method by which the social life of man is ordered. Politics enter into all human relationships, even the most intimate. Social conditions, wages, housing,

food, education, culture, minority rights, war, peace, prosperity and depressions, everything depends on politics or is linked with politics. Politics have become the central concern of modern man.

Should such an all-important matter be indifferent to the cause of the Kingdom of God, or bear no relationship to that which is itself every day reality? Bad politics are like a miasmic swamp whose evil vapors poison and cause to wither all living things in its neighborhood. Should the Christian stand aside or take himself and his goods to a safe retreat, seek escape into pietism and quietism—o, if my own precious dear soul is only saved?

Or, should he not rather, as a member of the *Militia Christi*, help drain the swamp, purify the air and heal the soil? Should he not expose the evils of society, expose a mode of production that carries in its bosom as inevitable concomitants mass-exploitation, race hatred, class hatred, starvation and imperialist war? Combat the vapors by prayer or drain the swamp itself? What becomes of God's sovereignty if the world is left in the hands of the powers of darkness, if they are not disputed their sway inch by inch, by political action, by protest, by sensitizing the conscience of man, by revolution?

Ah, but that would involve struggle, fighting, politics, a battle to the death! True, but Jesus and the Prophets never hesitated to disturb the social order in the interest of social justice. To leave things as they are is to reduce all ethical ideals and moral values to empty, hollow gestures.

In the cosmic universe God Himself is the totally different element which cannot be seized by or laid down in any of the categories of human logic. Man's actions and deeds are God's Kingdom, the manifestation of God, the incarnation of the dream. On man's actions, on his politics depends the salvation of the world.

The dream of the Kingdom of God is not without its disillusion. No reality is. The struggle to bring it to earth is not without its defeats. Never did any man, except One, bear the highest ideal without besmudging it himself. Never was a real great struggle waged without terrible defeats. Never, also, did an ideal evaporate without its champions believing that its fulfilment was near. Always in the course of history does the shore of the land of freedom recede in the distance. And yet our expectation remains as vivid as that of the old Prophets even as the hope remains as unfulfilled as that of the first Seers?

Or is it otherwise? Is not the greatest blessing of the thirst for righteousness and of the hope of freedom, that it brings inspiration, elevation, purification even now, that it fills the hearts of its champions and soldiers with the joy of having a share in the building of what is the unfulfilled, but the-ever-itself-fulfilling sense of life—the building of the Kingdom of God.

Whoever hopes for the freedom of God some day, let him become innerly free now. Who looks for a fraternal community of man in the future, let him become a brother now. Whoever believes in the coming of Justice and Righteousness, let him be a comrade now and step into the ranks. The dream blesses its servants and believers in the darkest hour. Loyalty to the Kingdom of God is joy. To fight for the Kingdom of God is politics and economics, it is bread and butter. It is the defense of the dignity of the human personality, in wage

disputes, in racial discrimination, in education, enlightenment, in science and art. A terrible, dreadful, never-ceasing struggle, dangerous and deadly.

"Dreadful is this place," said Jacob, "it is a house of God and a gate of heaven!"

IS THE PROTESTANT ANTI-CATHOLIC?

And other editorials by KENNETH LESLIE

It is generally conceded that the Basques are the most devout Roman Catholic people in the world. At the same time they are intransigent opponents of Vatican politics. The attitude of THE PROTESTANT to Vatican politics is precisely that of the Basques. Since it would be hardly fair to call the Basques anti-Catholic, so it is hardly fair to call THE PROTESTANT anti-Catholic. Yet that is what many of the Bishops' newspapers do call THE PROTESTANT. Truth is not on the side of these bishops.

When THE PROTESTANT attacks Fascists who happen to be priests we do the Church a great service. When editors say, as one editor did say, that in attacking Father Coughlin, for instance, we attack the Church, those editors do the Church a great disservice, for they thus identify the fortunes of their Church with the fortunes of Fascism. It is true that mighty prelates in the Church do the same thing. Even so, we deny that the Roman Catholic Church is essentially Fascist, and we look upon the modern escapade of the Vatican's collaboration with the Fascists as a desperate contradiction to her own nature. We anticipate a renunciation of this whole suicidal trend, a turning from death to life once more, a turning once more to Him who knocks on the door of the human heart, a revulsion from all this unnatural traffic with the Nazi truncheon.

NCCJ SMOKE-SCREENS FASCISM

The National Conference of Christians and Jews goes right on performing the function for which it appears to have been founded: that of furthering the divisive schemes of Fascism on the home front as it has already done on the foreign front. With sanctimonious cruelty it "interfered" for clerical-fascism when it betrayed and murdered free Spain. With no less unctuous callousness it now "covers up" for the same monster as it begins to uncoil its slimy tail here in America.

Within the past few weeks a large number of vicious beatings of Jews has taken place here in New York. Much of it is done by children, but the Mayor and the Commissioner of Investigation agree that "the children are instigated by vicious people who wanted to see this kind of vandalism." I am quoting the Mayor as reported in the *New York Herald Tribune* (Dec. 31, 1943). He doesn't say why they want this vandalism. Perhaps he doesn't know. Perhaps he has not really grasped what this war is about. He mentions the Ku Klux Klan as having been implicated presumably in similar doings in 1928. Then he drops another hint: "The same mentality you will find in other organiza-

tions, I am sorry to say. I would say there is quite a remnant of some organized movements that have outwardly subsided since Pearl Harbor."

The Mayor is obviously referring to the Christian Front and its allied hoodlums whose fuehrer Father Coughlin is still at large. He doesn't say so, but from where he sits he is brave to say even that much. But the representative of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Mr. Willard Johnson, goes right to bat to "cover" for the Christian Front by stating: "After studying Bridgeport, Hartford, Boston, and Chicago, I am convinced that the outbreaks are individual rather than organized and come from boys and girls in homes where there is an unfortunate type of 'dining-room propaganda.' This turns the boys in the direction of anti-Semitism. They as individuals give expression to the attitudes heard in their homes. The problem is to reach these homes through the churches, schools and clubs. That is what we intend to do." (*New York Times*, Dec. 31, 1943.)

Now supposing that Fascists really exist. A wild supposition I will admit. Certainly I do not expect Mr. Willard Johnson to entertain any such notion. But those who hold the pen he writes with may possibly grant the hypothesis for a moment. Suppose the Fascists (like the mythical Nazis in Europe) would really like to divide and terrorize the people. And suppose that, having seen the devilish success of anti-Semitism in Europe, the native breed of conjectural Fascists should be seized with the brilliant idea of trying it here. And then *suppose they are going right ahead with it now*. I ask you what could better serve their purpose than for an eminently respectable organization like the Conference of Christians and Jews to call the whole thing a fiction and to say that after serious study it concludes that this thing is not organized at all but just "dining-room propaganda."

Then having smoke-screened organized Fascism the Conference bares its own teeth in the comforting thought, "It takes a long time to do it, but it's the only way." Let Jewish mothers be reassured. There is no Christian Front. There is no Ku Klux Klan. There are no clerical-Fascists. There is no anti-Semitism taught in the Christian churches. There is just "dining-room propaganda."

JEW BEATINGS AND THE POLISH CRISIS

New York is the nerve center of the Americas, and what happens in New York is news everywhere throughout the world. What is happening at the present moment to the Jews in New York becomes at once a signal to Jews everywhere and to Jew-baiting Fascists everywhere. At least 200 beatings of Jews have taken place in New York in the recent past.

These beatings are significant. They spell out something. What do they spell? Do you remember the first crisis of Fascism? That crisis took place in Spain. It took place when the arrows of the Falange were in the ascendant and were fain to blot out the light of freedom's sun. They did blot it out in continental Europe. Do you remember that period? Do you remember what happened then in New York at the nerve center of the Americas? A job had to be done here for Fascism. That job was to paralyze the arm of democracy and see

that it did not aid the people of Spain. That job was done. And one of the preliminaries to the doing of that job was the beating of Jews. Yes, the same Jew beatings, by the same Christian Front elements responsible today, as hints to the Jews of what their lot might be if they refused to play their role. What role? *The role of deflecting liberal opinion from its vital task of telling the truth about Spain.* Along with this tactic went open praise of Hitler by the then respectable Father Coughlin.

Today we are faced with another crisis of Fascism. This time the arrows are descending. The sun of freedom is clearing. The Red Army of liberation marches into Poland. Fascism has come full circle. Its heyday is over. It is on the defensive—but not yet defeated. It has a place to go, the Americas. This hemisphere will be its last stand. Already it has captured Argentina and its spore moves northward. Now once more in this new crisis we have similar outbreaks in New York of Jew beatings by Christian Front elements and we have open praise of Franco by the most respected Archbishop Spellman.

Poland, which made not one but many Lidices in the Ukraine when, under the leadership of Achille Ratti, she beat the Bolsheviks in a post-war war little noticed in this country; Poland, which tore a piece out of Czechoslovakia, when Hitler's wolves ravished that country after Munich; Poland, which rewarded the peasants, demanding agricultural reforms, with bullets; Poland, whose city workers, receiving starvation wages, received instead of higher pay more bullets; Poland, the blood of whose peasants and city workers flowed in field and street; *this is the Poland which is now to be clothed in white and presented to the world as the Sacred Cause Against Russia.*

The beating of Jews in New York today is one more signal to Jews everywhere. It is meant to say: "Jews, you had better behave. Jews, this is only a taste of what may come to you unless you do what we tell you to do. Jews, you have considerable influence with newspapers and in other places. You had better use all your influence to prevent America from seeing the truth about Poland, just as you once used that influence to prevent America from seeing the truth about Spain. Jews, keep your heads down. You form a great part of the vanguard of liberalism. We are serving notice on you through this slight sample, this light brush of a pogrom, that you had better behave, that you had better see to it that liberal opinion is carried away into harmless detours. Just as the vital truth of Spain was kept from the American people so now the vital truth of Poland must be kept from America. This in the interests of our Fascism which, having been wiped from the continent of Europe, proposes to retreat to the hemisphere of the Americas where we shall nurse our wounds and regain our strength for a new battle in the future!"

POWER POLITICS AND WORLD PEACE

We agree pretty well with the conclusions of Taraknath Das in his article in this issue, but we do not quite share all of his gloom. Moscow-Cairo-Teheran began to make explicit a long-known fact: the struggle between the socialist world and the private-profit world has not been resolved by the present war.

(Editorial continued on page 27)

PROTESTANT AND JEW

A series of sermons and papers by eminent Protestant churchmen compiled and edited by Rev. Dr. Joshua Bloch

INTRODUCTION

The Rev. Dr. Cyrus Augustus Bartol (1813-1900) who was a native of Maine, was educated in the schools of Portland, Me., and received his B.A. degree from Bowdoin College in 1832. Three years later he graduated from the Harvard Divinity School and for a year he preached in Cincinnati and elsewhere. He was then called to the West Church (Congregational) of Boston, a center of liberal religious influences and patriotic enthusiasm, to become associate of the Rev. Dr. Charles Lowell, the father of James Russell Lowell. On Dr. Lowell's death, in 1861, he was appointed Lowell's successor and held that post as active pastor until 1889, when he was made pastor emeritus, a position he occupied till the end of his days. In 1859 Harvard University conferred on him the degree of Doctor of Sacred Theology.

Of slight physique and delicate frame the Rev. Bartol "was a man of faith and hope and love who worshipped neither antiquity nor novelty but found the presence of God in nature, in history, and in humanity" (Samuel Atkins Eliot). During a large part of his ministry, certainly after Theodore Parker died, Dr. Bartol was the most original Unitarian preacher in Boston, a radical of radicals in theology and a transcendentalist in philosophy. Dr. Bartol belonged to that noteworthy circle of self-reliant and independent men and women who usually identified themselves with the ideas and ideals of Ralph Waldo Emerson. They comprised the group that, in a large measure, made the fame of literary Boston in the middle of the nineteenth century. He looked upon the world as a temple of the living God in which it was good to dwell and he saw only the best in every man. He was as prolific a preacher as he was a writer. A complete bibliography of his publications appears in Heralds of a Liberal Faith by C. G. Ames, edited by S. A. Eliot, Boston, 1910, vol. 3, pp. 17-22. The Rev. Bartol's sermon on "The Church and the Synagogue" is reprinted from his Discourses on the Christian Body and Form, Boston, 1853, pp. 63-75.

This sermon was preached at the West Church of Boston shortly after the dedication, in 1852, of the Jewish house of worship, a small frame building on Warrenton (then known as Warren) street by Congregation Ohabei Shalom which has been described as "the first out-and-out synagogue in Massachusetts" (See Joseph Lebowich, "The Jews in Boston till 1875" in Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society, No. 12, New York, 1904, p. 111.

The description of the dedication service given by Dr. Bartol is impressive. Indeed, he was so profoundly touched by it that he "felt that the despised and dispersed children of Abraham, by their concord, though a mere handful, under such cruel disadvantages and burdens, might yet teach a lesson to not a few of those . . . calling themselves followers of the Son of God." For an account of "The Dedication of Massachusetts' First Synagogue" see Lee M. Friedman, Jewish Pioneers and Patriots, Philadelphia, 1942, pp. 116-129. A description of the consecration services of this synagogue is found in The Occident, Philadelphia, 1852, vol. 10, pp. 104-108.

THE CHURCH AND THE SYNAGOGUE

A sermon by CYRUS AUGUSTUS BARTOL

"He went into their synagogue." Matt. xii, 9.

"To Him be glory in the Church." Eph. iii, 21.

THERE may appear something strange and conflicting in the relations of Christ to the synagogue and church. He frequented the synagogue, taught in the synagogue, listened to the doctrine and joined in the praise of the synagogue, and availed himself of the public religious opportunities of the synagogue to lay the foundation of his church. Yet it somewhat shocks our associations thus to bring together these two, the synagogue and the church; the synagogue that persecuted Jesus to the death, and the church that was to enshrine his name in everlasting honor; the synagogue that arraigned, imprisoned, and slew his disciples, and the church, the glorious monument of their labor and self-sacrifice; the synagogue, repository of narrow prejudice and source of bigoted zeal, and the church, channel of the noblest sentiments and largest principles ever published on earth.

With all these contrasts, however, there is one point in which the church and synagogue meet, as being both social instruments for the establishment of religion; and both illustrating the dependence of religion upon social feeling for its local maintenance and universal diffusion. The meaning of the word *synagogue*, and of the word translated *church*, is essentially the same,—the gathering or calling together of persons agreeing with each other. First the synagogue, then the church, was the power God used to unite men, and raise them to himself. We are acquainted with but two great revelations, the Jewish and the Christian. It is remarkable that, in the one and the other alike, the

doctrine and law made known from on high were entrusted, for their preservation and efficiency, not to an abstraction or oral tradition, not alone to learning, eloquence, book, or discourse, but to an organization and society.

Witnessing, in this city, the recent dedication of a Jewish synagogue, impressed on my mind this common lesson of the synagogue and the church. When I saw the sacred scrolls of the Pentateuch of Moses—which, often transcribed, had travelled down from time immemorial—brought so solemnly into their sanctuary by a band of Israelites, with that attendant voice of human unison in divine thanksgiving, which most of all things touches the heart; and beheld the several facsimile copies made to guard against possible error, borne slowly about seven times, circling with the seven-fold chanting of the ancient psalms of Judea, in the peculiarly sweet tones of the harmonious choir; and then the reverential deposit of the decorated rolls, before the face of the congregation, in the ark of the covenant, with the accompanying prayers to which the Amen of the people, like a musical wind, swept through the little room, and wafted up the many silent beating hearts towards heaven;—I felt that the despised and dispersed children of Abraham, by their concord, though a mere handful, under such cruel disadvantages and burdens, might yet teach a lesson to not a few of those recorded in our ecclesiastical registers, and calling themselves followers of the Son of God.

The silver bells, that tinkled over the adorned parchment, seemed to echo the

meaning of those golden ones in the times of the Hebrew glory wrought on the priestly robes. The scarfs, that hung on the shoulders carrying the holy vessels, appeared as it were the faded remnants of the garments, splendid with costly stones, once worn by the sons of Aaron. The little vase, lighted beside the consecrated place with a perpetual flame, never day or night thenceforward to be suffered to go out, looked like the residue of precious lamps and shining censers. The so slight, diminished band of devotees, beyond documents and manuscripts that scholars pore over, walked in living testimony of the ancient union. The faith of Abraham, piety of Isaac, and sagacity of Jacob, stood on visible features of flesh and blood. All the forms handed down through ages, for links to bind one soul with another in the service of a common Maker, bespoke the value of man's sympathy with his brother-man, to preserve and defend forever against waste and extinction the disclosed truths of religion.

Thus may I not say the Jew has a lesson for the Christian, and the synagogue for the church? Consider the immense importance, to all the world indeed, of that synagogue. What had kept the saving ideas of a divine original inspiration, flowing a sacred river far back out of undiscovered sources in a hoar antiquity, from sinking into forgetfulness amid the sandy wastes of time? It was not merely the record of them on paper and stone. That Egyptian paper would crumble; and the tables, soon broken beneath the Mount, be at last reduced to powder. But, as a literary or religious association survives out of the burnt and blackened ruins of the building in which it has met, so, beyond engraving or inscription, a social power redeemed the heavenly instructions and commands from the whelming oblivion. It was meeting together, first in the open air, next in the houses of the prophets, then,

for a better accommodation, in the synagogue, planted commonly in some picturesque situation, that appropriated to the bosom of the race the words of its Law-giver. The life, the spiritual substance of the people, was received and embodied, brought to a head of immediate influence, and conducted in a perennial stream, by the synagogue.

Whence and wherefore, to make our melody with, have we now those sublime psalms, sung, not here and there alone by scattered Israelites, crouching, almost unseen, in Rome and London, in Amsterdam and New York; but by vast bodies of Christian believers, from the shores washed by the Indian Ocean to the waters of the Pacific Seas? As the great poems and tragedies, now the delight of the world, were composed to be publicly recited or enacted; so they were written, not simply for a solitary harp or a midnight orison, but for the synagogue and the temple. How did that grand doctrine, which is the crown of our rejoicing, of the unity of God, first declared to his chosen people, stand against the tide of polytheism and idolatry, for long thousands of years, till, like the ark across the deluge, it reached safely the time when it should be reaffirmed forever, through all generation, by Jesus Christ? It was clasped to the breast of the nation by this mighty sympathetic power of the synagogue and the Sanhedrin or great synagogue, with all the ceremonies and festivals that drew the various tribes of Canaan together. What but this same social energy of affection; giving life to religion after the lapse of fifty centuries, crossed the Atlantic, and, at the diameter of the earth, distant from its first seat, has summoned together among us the scanty members of a nation still vital and indissoluble; while the roving, disconnected savages, that once possessed this whole continent, are almost without an epitaph, fading away? Truly, the

synagogue in a grove of Judea, or by a stream of Galilee, was the part of synagogues in a world far off, and then unknown!

There is something fine and admirable even in the humble circumstances of such a spectacle. The courageous and cheerful rearing, upon a close street in a low quarter of the city, of that small synagogue, to be overshadowed by the steeples and towers of a hundred Christian edifices, with their belfries' clang about its mute, narrow dome, that a few might worship the God of their fathers in the way of their fathers, prompts the question whether we, with the sum and sceptre of social power in our hands, employ it to deepen and extend our religion with an earnestness like theirs, and results proportioned to our means. Avoiding the voices of the synagogue, the pride and hatred and spiritual conceit that grew up within its old limits in Palestine, have we, in the Christian church, its virtues of religious faith and cordial sympathy by respect for the holy rites, and by sincere performance of the appointed ordinances, which Christ made part of his gospel,—by regard for the book of the Lord, and observance of those hallowed times and places, the special conductors of his spirit, itself unbounded, into the infirmity of our nature, and the sinful worldliness of our hearts? Such is the question which the grave order of that Hebrew dedication presents, and the loud strain of its anthems pours into our ears. Have we, too, proved what affection and honor for one another, in the faith and veneration of God, can do to sink his word into our convictions, and exemplify it in our lives? Or, idle in our full prosperity and easy predominance over all Pagan and Jewish modes, do we sit, careless of each other, with our children drawn hither and thither by curiosity or rumor, as though it were some trump of fame we were listening for, and not the ever-

lasting gospel of God? Let the manner of our own coming in and going out, and the measure of our concern for the general good, answer.

Will it be said these days of freedom, and of doing as we and our children please, are better than the former days; and it is unworthy to go back, for a theme of exhortation, to half-obsolete customs, that flourished in by-gone times; as though a Christian, in his church, could learn aught from a synagogue and a Jew! But let us not forget the rock from which we were hewn, the root from which we have grown, and the olive-tree into which, by favor, we were grafted. Let not the Anglo-Saxon, for shame, forget his obligations to the Hebrew. Let him not forget of whom, according to the flesh, of the house of David, of the seed of Judah, his Saviour was born. Let him not forget his own so long-descended heritage, from the appearance in the flame of Horeb, and from the commandments that rolled in the thunders, and were cut by the lightnings of Sinai.

We may be proud of our modern inventions and discoveries. We may boast our art and science. We may tell what we can do with our press and compass, with our looms and engines, with our iron rail and electric wire. Nevertheless, those old Hebrews, now vagabond and scorned, are our spiritual progenitors. In the name of God, they claim our filial debt of religious gratitude. Though now, like thin hordes of Arabs in the desert, they wander in fancy through the magnificent space of their ancient history; we, and all the dwellers in Christendom, walk with them over a common ground of annals, unequalled odes, and exalted prophecies. We are inextricably united with them, for time and eternity, though so broadly separated, too, by the new instructions of a greater Teacher than they ever acknowledged. Truly the by-word and hissing

for the Jew has been carried farther than has been good for the Christian. They can teach us, that the social power, by which, through the synagogue, they have so widely inoculated mankind with the sublime persuasions of the oneness and justice of God, must be more firmly relied on, and more vigorously wielded, to instil the additional lessons of our Divine Master.

So whispers the synagogue to the church. Such was the information conveyed to my ear from the lips of yonder preacher and choristers, as the Hebrew and English tongues alternated in the voice of their prayer and praise. Such is the message of Providence I report to you. Nor let us, in any arrogance of birth or belief, disdain to learn from a Jew. "Hath not a Jew eyes, senses, affections, passions?"—yes, and experience too; by which, while discarding his errors, we may wisely profit in our endeavors to let our light shine, and to propagate our faith. By his example we may be led not to trust our individual judgments, and rest on our independent wills alone, indolently shouting, "Truth is mighty, and will prevail;" but to avail ourselves of the same social united force to illuminate and warm the world with the beams of mercy from Calvary and the Mount of Olives, as well as with the fire that came down the awful summits of Arabia.

Compared with the synagogue, the church is, in its methods, spare and spiritual. As though its Author would provide against all superstition and formality, it originally received from him the least of outward ritual that would suffice to clothe it. In our own view and practice, it has no excess, beyond that Author's mind, of symbol and form. All the more must we take care that the ties it offers to pass through our hearts be not neglected. If ours be a dead or loose and languishing church, as public worshippers we must decline.

Count ourselves, as we fondly may, in the most enlightened fellowship of believers, yet must we mournfully die, not for refusing to be a sect, but for refusing to be of Christ's church; and over our grave a less elevated, less rational understanding of religion will rise, with unscriptural pomp, to usurp the post given for our loyalty to maintain, but by our infidelity betrayed. If our liberality run into license, the salt losing its savor, worldliness and unbelief will creep into our temples and into the schools of piety and knowledge which our fathers bequeathed; and their inscription, "To Christ and the Church," from the marble where they printed it, have to be erased.

If we, in this spot, are indifferent, our heart not enlisted, nor our hand engaged for the common good, our mind not directed to perceive in mutual cordiality a soil for the growth of personal character and of the joy of public devotion, then let even the old synagogue plead with us, and, by what amid faults was faithful in its work, warn us against being recreant in ours. We may hold the Jew hostile to us, yet, according to a wise proverb, "It is lawful to be instructed by an enemy." Let the policy of his institutions, firm through all the outlawries and wrongs he has suffered, convince us of the value and need of religious union. Let it be a demonstration, that we can set on foot, and, by our constant and punctual interest, encourage no cooperation for generous, social ends, be it a Sunday-school or a Bible-class, a vestry-meeting or a library for the young or the old, which will not reward every effort of conscientious kindness with contributions to the individual and general improvement; till we know that our humanity is blessed only by a baptism in divinity.

The Jews have been bound so inveterately together, in part, no doubt, by the very agonies of exile and captivity

and scorn they have endured; and it has been said, that some form of calamity or opposition is necessary to bind and defend Christians against the worse combined perils of spiritual lukewarmness and worldly success. But is there not, in the course of nature and providence, adversity and trial enough to rivet in faith and love our souls? Common danger does press men in close ranks together. But in our actual condition in this world, with disappointment dogging our steps, with pain and sickness and grief on our track, with death slow and keen holding us ever in pursuit, and many foes in full cry after us soon to seize their several shares of all that is mortal for their prey, what more want we to consolidate us? Even as the irrational tribes of the lower creation, in common fear and anguish, flock together; so, under the throng of ills that flesh is heir to, shall we not find solace in communion? Need we, like the old Hebrews, be driven out from our pleasant seats by war, or scourged in them by famine, or led away into some far Chaldea, to hang the harps of our gladness upon the willows by the rivers of Babylon, before our religion can be dear to us?

Whether, however, by adversity driven, or, in disgust with earthly prosperity, drawn to seek the consolations of the Christian faith, those consolations will abound only as we nourish the sympathies through which, by God's

decree, they flow; and those sympathies will thrive but in proportion to our intercourse through the forms and means which are the language of religion,—a language speaking when the tongue is silent, and often more potent than the tongue in its speech.

This is celebrated as the reading age. Yet we should remember, it is not only arbitrary characters that carry meaning to our souls. The heavens and the earth are but a grand system of natural signs to convey the truth and mind of God. And God has, moreover, consulted the nature of the human heart, by ordaining another style of language, in the emblems through which our spirits may converse. Christ, the spirit, of all spirits that ever wore flesh, transcendent in insight and pure intuition of excellence, yet appointed certain forms, and showed his supreme wisdom in saying, "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them;" and, "Do this in remembrance of me." The Jew, in his synagogue, used an earlier, more juvenile vocabulary, copious and vivid with altar and sacrifice, procession and feast, outer court and holy of holies; requiring a ritual more striking and complex according to his imperfect culture. In terms more simple and beautiful, significant of loftier affections and higher hopes, the Son of God desired that Christians should communicate in his church. Let not the terms be neglected, lest the ideas and sentiments they set forth fall into disuse.

* * *

ADMONITION TO THE ECSTATIC

It is sin to judge your brother's determination (slow, deliberative) in the light of your ecstatic hope and inner knowledge. He is above you, not below, and the true follower of the gleam doffs his hat to his brother who sweats upon the road. He feels the load, you don't. There is always the possibility you are not pulling one, and he is.

K. L.

THE AJC BETRAYS DEMOCRACY

By JOSEPH BRAININ

—An examination of the record of the American Jewish Committee.

INTRODUCTION

THE POPE is in a tight place . . . he must support Nazi philosophy in the hope of defeating Communism in Russia and checking the advance of socialism in France and Spain."

This is a quotation from *Ambassador William E. Dodd's Diary*, written on March 11, 1935. It is a candid and lucid statement. Only a man wise in world affairs, yet intransigently faithful to democracy, could have written it. Mr. Dodd does not say that the Pope will support Nazism. He concludes with inexorable logic that the Pope *must* support Nazism. Dodd knew that the Vatican's self-interest demanded its alignment with Franco, Munich and Vichy.

I was haunted by the Ambassador's logic when I studied the record of the American Jewish Committee. It provided the answer to the puzzling question of why members of a Committee of wealthy Jews, organized for the defense of Jewish rights, should support, appease and condone notorious Fascist groups in the country. The answer, to paraphrase Mr. Dodd, is this: They are in a tight place. They *must* support, or at least appease Fascism because their self-interest demands it, because they consider Communism the real enemy.

My answer will probably please the gentlemen of the American Jewish Committee. All these years they have lived in terror lest they be called Communists. When Hitler's astute propaganda coined the label *Bolshevik-Jews* they trembled. Not because they feared for the fate of European Jewry, but because the label might be attached to them here, in this country.

Did the frightened members of the American Jewish Committee openly at-

tack Nazism in the early days of anti-Jewish persecution in Germany? No. They believed that a deal might be made, a deal which would direct Nazi anti-Semitism against the Bolshevik-Jews exclusively. They refused to join the American Jewish Congress and Samuel Untermyer's Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League in the boycott of German goods. Instead, they put into circulation reams of material laboriously compiled by the Committee's research workers to prove statistically that only a minimal percentage of the Communist leadership in Russia and other countries was Jewish. How like the Chamberlain policy of Munich, which sought to divert Nazi aggression towards the Soviet Union!

These charges and many more I shall prove conclusively. If I merely mention them at the outset, in lieu of an introduction, it is to establish the incontrovertible basic fact that the self-interest of the members of the American Jewish Committee clashes and conflicts with the interest of the Jewish people as a whole.

Even at this late date the gentlemen around Judge Proskauer, President of the American Jewish Committee, reject the axiomatic truth that *whoever is an anti-Semite is a Fascist and whoever is a Fascist is an anti-Semite*. If the members of the American Jewish Committee had learned this lesson, which European Jewry has learned at such great cost, they could not have elected the Honorable Joseph M. Proskauer as their leader in 1943. Judge Proskauer's record as one of the founders of the now defunct American Liberty League, a forerunner of America First, should have sufficed to disqualify him. The Liberty League, it will be remembered, not only stubbornly

opposed the social reforms of the New Deal, but through several members of its National Executive Committee (to which Judge Proskauer belonged) gave substantial financial assistance to the Sentinels, an anti-Semitic organization. Unless one is afflicted with a double personality of the Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde type, one cannot be a reactionary in American politics, hobnob with Fascist-minded supporters of anti-Semitic movements, and at the same time be a liberal defender of Jewish rights and fundamental democratic principles.

* * *

The American Jewish Committee has set itself up as the supreme arbiter on all matters affecting Jewish interests. It considers itself the appraiser of any organizational effort, whether Jewish or Christian, dealing with the Jewish problem. When it decides to undermine any action which it regards as running counter to its own appeasement policy it uses the old reliable Red smear. Even where the Dies Committee hesitates to use the Communist bugaboo the American Jewish Committee steps in. Not openly, of course. It uses a more round-about method.

When a group of aggressive young Jews began publishing *Equality* to counteract Father Coughlin's *Social Justice*, the Committee frowned on this brazen breach of its hush-hush policy. But, to make matters worse, the publishers of *Equality* inaugurated a most effective way of distribution. They recruited an army of courageous young men and women to sell their publication on street corners side by side with the hawkers of Father Coughlin's anti-Semitic magazine. That was too much for the American Jewish Committee to swallow. It issued forthwith, though of course quietly, a circular to guide prospective financial supporters of *Equality*. The text of this circular was typical of

the Committee's approach in "fighting" anti-Semitism. It read:

"*Equality* is an independent, non-sectarian monthly journal which has as its object the defense of democratic rights and the combating of racial and religious intolerance.

"Although we are, of course, in accord with the anti-Nazi policy and its concern with the maintenance of civil and religious liberties, a consistent examination of this periodical has indicated a Communist slant which in our opinion detracts from its usefulness."

Let us examine this masterpiece of skilful smearing, which bears all the earmarks of that expensive legal talent of which the American Jewish Committee possesses so impressive an array. To protect itself from a possible libel suit the Committee readily admits that *Equality* is an independent journal, but then proceeds to "damn with faint praise, and without sneering teach the rest to sneer." In other words, the Committee concludes that anti-Semitism is preferable to an indication of "a Communist slant." Anything to avoid Hitler's label of Bolshevik-Jew, even if it means appeasing the clerical Fascist sponsors of Father Coughlin. The supporters of Nazism and Fascism in this country knew, when they read this circular, that they had nothing to fear from the gentlemen of the American Jewish Committee.

The same red smear was applied several years ago to THE PROTESTANT, then *The Protestant Digest*. The text of the letter circulated against *The Protestant Digest* read as follows:

"*The Protestant Digest* appears to be closely affiliated with the Religious Union for Democracy, formerly the American Alliance for Christians and Jews. Inasmuch as certain individuals in control of both the publication and the Union have identified themselves with the Communist Party line and have adopted an anti-Catholic rather than an anti-Coughlin policy, we feel that nothing helpful to the cause of inter-faith good will is likely to emerge from the

activities of either the *Digest* or the Union, in spite of their apparent liberal and democratic point of view."

Here again we have the same careful legalistic language. THE PROTESTANT appears to be affiliated . . . nothing helpful is *likely to emerge* . . . *their apparent liberal and democratic point of view* . . . Of course the denunciation of THE PROTESTANT is primarily intended to reassure the clerical Fascist diocese responsible for Father Coughlin's anti-Semitic campaigns that the American Jewish Committee is ready and willing to brand as Communist any group that dares attack the sponsorship and parentage of Father Coughlin. As far as the Committee is concerned Father Coughlin sprang out of a hermetically sealed bottle and is a political and spiritual orphan.

* * *

The American Jewish Committee did not—and, for that matter, does not to this day—recognize the existence of domestic Fascism in this country. No reference is ever made in the Committee's public or even confidential reports to any relationship between anti-Semitic activities and political Fascist groups. Since the advent of Hitler it hardly ever mentions anti-Semitism without the prefix *Nazi*. According to the American Jewish Committee's interpretation, Nazi-anti-Semitism is the only brand of racial or religious anti-Jewishness in America. In May, 1941, the American Jewish Committee distributed to a select group of "key men" a confidential memorandum signed S. W., presumably Sidney Wallach, then the associate secretary of the Committee, so revealing that I am tempted to present the full text of that unique document. Lack of space, however, compels me to limit myself to its essential highlights (the italics are all mine):

"In the past four years the expanded activities of the American Jewish Committee," writes Mr. Wallach, "have for

the most part been intended as a counter-attack on the Nazis and *their propaganda in general*, on the theory that in discrediting these, *Nazi anti-Semitism would be both pushed out of the limelight of public attention and incidentally discredited along with them.*

"We functioned as a public relations agency following the usual strategies of publicity, which required only slight modification to make them applicable to our work. The grand strategy of all publicity is an appeal, either blunt or discreet, to the self-interest of the audience.

"But our *inherently limited* appeal was not likely to achieve more than limited results. It attempted to discredit a propaganda source, in this case the Nazis. The net result of such efforts may be—indeed is—that both discreditees and discreditors—Nazis and Jews—land in the dog-house.

"But the most important disadvantage arises from the fact that in deciding to devote our major energies to this appeal to self-interest, *we consciously decided to allow the gravest accusations against the Jews to go relatively unchallenged; we not only did not counter the charges, we decided in effect to put up no defense.* From the resources allotted to us we drained the larger portion to expose the enemy. *Only a small amount of money and side-thoughts were given to the task of combatting what we call 'misconceptions'.* In casting up accounts, therefore, we find that while we have contributed to the defeat of the immediate political objectives of the Nazis in this country, the misconceptions which make for bad group attitudes and relations have gained credence."

Let us pause for a moment. For here we have the American Jewish Committee hush hush policy robed by its own spokesman in the solemn garb of a basic ideology. Read it carefully. The aim of the Committee was to "push out of the limelight of public attention" Nazi-anti-Semitism. (To this policy it adhered rigorously). It "not only did not counter the charges" but "decided in effect to put up no defense". (Here again the Committee did not deviate one inch from its decision.) Please keep in mind also that the confidential memorandum

covers the four crucial years of Fascist expansion in this country, from 1937 to the summer of 1941.

No wonder, then, that during this critical period the American Jewish Committee played a sad role in the Jewish fight against anti-Semitism. Its function was to keep anti-Semitism covered up and to prevent other organizations, Jewish or Christian from exposing it. In line with this policy it had to smear aggressive groups counter-attacking Fascism on the Jewish sector. It had to protect clerical Fascism and throw a blanket of silence over the activities of the Henry Ford men who consistently supported and promoted Nazism, Fascism and anti-Semitism. But the appeasement policy inevitably led to col-

laboration on the anti-Communist front with the very elements the Committee should have fought.

Why did the Committee lend itself to the suppression of anti-Franco sentiments among the Jews of this country? Why was it instrumental in the setting up of The National Conference of Christians and Jews? Why did it lend such strong financial and other support to the American Jewish Labor Committee? And why does it combat Zionism today although nothing in its charter justifies its expenditure of effort and funds on this internal Jewish controversy?

These are only a few of the questions I shall take up in the succeeding articles.

* * *

"Separated from the people the Church placed itself at the side of the aristocracy, the new rich, the land owners, the army. I began to experience a growing repugnance at the interlacing of the Catholic hierarchy with the privileged classes and their politics. The Church had taken a position (a) that was anti-people and anti-Christian. The Church identified itself with the bloody repression and cruel terror of 1904 directed against the workers and the liberals. When the bishops and priests openly supported Fascism, a Christian could not help oppose them and denounce the three great spiritual falsehoods which were supporting Fascism and destroying culture in Spain—the official Church, the corrupt aristocracy, and bourgeoisie and the army. The Church in its real role as Christian, as Catholic, is not under attack anywhere but we cannot help but fight the Church Fascist, the Church belligerent, because Fascism is the negation of all that is Christian. It denies all human values that Christianity has fought for through the centuries—all that we associate with liberty and human dignity. We are true to the Church when we drive the heresy of Fascism from the Church. There is no persecution of the Church. Churches and convents have been closed, in general as a military measure. Priests succeeded in convincing the women of the convents that the Fascist cause was holy and they permitted the Fascists to occupy their buildings as bases of attack. Church buildings became forts and arsenals. It is a harsh truth but none the less a truth that for months before the Fascist revolt, gatherings in churches were not for prayer but for incitement to rebellion."

JOSE BERGAMIN

quoted in McGovern's "WHY THE BISHOPS
BACK FRANCO"

AN ANSWER TO DON STURZO

By GEORGE LA PIANA and GAETANO SALVEMINI

—*With Don Sturzo's permission we will not leave to future historians what can be proved now by unimpeachable evidence.*

OUR book, *What To Do With Italy*, has been received by most Catholic papers with a flood of personal vituperation of its authors. No attempt at informing the reader about its contents, no discussion or repudiation of specific facts or interpretations has been made. All questions have been settled merely by calling the authors names. This should not surprise anybody. Bishop Hurley of St. Augustine has warned us that the "only merit" of too many Catholic "practitioners" is "their mastery in the acid of vituperation."

There is no need for us to engage in spitting contests with such "practitioners." But we cannot ignore criticisms when they are offered by a man like Don L. Sturzo. Even if we differ with him on vital subjects, we have to pay homage to his moral integrity, his intelligence, the dignified way he has suffered for his cause, and last but not least, the scanty affection he enjoyed in the Vatican during the Fascist period.

In his article *The Church and Democracy and Salvemini-La Piana* published by the Jesuit weekly *America* (November 6, 1943), Don Sturzo sets out to disprove our contention that modern democracy as it is understood and practised in the United States and as we should like it to be established in Italy when this war is over, is incompatible with the doctrine of the Catholic Church.

The argument we gave in our book ran as follows. The cornerstone of modern democracy consists of freedom of conscience and worship for all, freedom of speech and the press for all and freedom of association for all. Without these liberties there is no democracy. Catholic theology, in logical consistency with the Church's claims of divine

uniqueness as a way of salvation, condemns these freedoms and has ruled again and again that they are heretical, execrable and deadly to human society. When it has to adapt itself to conditions which it cannot overcome, the Vatican "tolerates" democratic regimes and movements, and resorts to compromises dictated by necessity. But according to the doctrine of the Church a modern democratic regime is bad by itself.

Don Sturzo does not contest our statement about the Catholic doctrine, but he finds fault with our definition of Christian democracy.

The fact is that in his encyclical letter, *Graves de Communi* (January 18, 1901), Leo XIII taught that "Christian Democracy" was a rather "dangerous and ambiguous term" "according to many decent people." Those people "are mistrustful of such a term for more than one reason. They are afraid that the word may be wrongly taken as meaning popular government or showing a preference for that form of government over any other. They are afraid that it might appear that the Christian doctrine confines itself to forwarding the interests of the common people, while the other class of society would be, so to speak, left out. They are afraid that under such a deceiving word may be hidden some purpose of discrediting every kind of legitimate authority, either secular or religious."

To avoid such a misunderstanding Leo XIII set out to "define what the ideas of the Catholics should be on this matter." First of all they ought to repudiate the doctrine that "*in the state, power belongs to the people.*" The term democracy, to be sure, means popular regime. But the Catholics are allowed to make use of the term only after they have "*deprived it of all political meaning, and no other significance is attached*

to it but *benevolent Christian action among the people.*" To carry on this action, "the benevolent cooperation has to be sought, above all, from those who because of their social position, their wealth, their intellectual and moral culture, exercise the greatest influence over society."

These words are so clear that we do not grasp how Don Sturzo can write as follows:

"Leo's document must have had another aim than that of defining what kind of political democracy was suitable for Catholics. Nobody may say that the Pope did not know that democracy means a political regime by and for the people. When he pronounced this famous phrase: 'If democracy is Christian, it will do a great deal of good to the world,' he certainly meant that very democracy of which Salvemini and La Piana speak."

With all due respect to Don Sturzo, we maintain that when Leo XIII pronounced that famous phrase, he meant by democracy not what we mean, but just the opposite of what we mean. We did not go out of the way when we reminded our readers of the fact that the *Catholic Encyclopaedia of America* was true to Leo XIII's definition of Christian democracy when it stated that it had been in existence at least since the times of Constantine, who "in a period of famine chose the Bishops rather than the civil officials to distribute corn among a starving people, and thus showed his appreciation of Christian democracy."

To show that the Catholic doctrine is compatible with democracy—not only that democracy of which Leo XIII spoke but also that democracy of which we speak—Don Sturzo records various episodes in modern history which show that the Vatican was "tolerant and benevolent" towards democratic or partially democratic regimes and that the Church "never condemned" and "never opposed" the democratic parties formed in various countries after the first world war.

Many objections might be raised against Don Sturzo's interpretation of such episodes. But we do not need to argue about such points. We ourselves state in our book that "the Holy See, more indulgent than its theologians, does not look with disfavor upon the United States in spite of its being a modern democracy," (p. 146) that "Benedict XV allowed, if he did not favor, in all countries, even in Italy, the formation of political [democratic] parties having a Catholic membership," (p. 118), and last but not least, we stated that Don Sturzo's Party in Italy was organized "with the tacit permission of Benedict XV." (p. 172)

Our contention was and is that, when taking a "tolerant" attitude towards modern democratic regimes and movements, the Vatican was forced to compromise with the purpose of squeezing the lesser evil from undesired situations. But the anti-Democratic doctrine of the Church remains unchanged. Either it is what it is or it would no longer be what it is. In compromising with democracies the Church does not change its principles. They "remain inviolate in their sacred shrine." But since every compromise implies a lowering of claims, the Church in such cases "adopts lower criteria of action."

Don Sturzo has seen in the words "shrine" and "lower criteria" a "sarcastic" tinge and suspects that we accuse the Church of following "the theory that the end justifies the means." He attributes to us the thought that the Church puts principles in a shrine and then without discrimination adapts herself to the current realities. And he tells us: "Had she done so, she would have accepted a great deal of the Reformation, to avoid the dismemberment of European Christianity; she would have accepted a great deal of modern naturalistic rationalism."

The fact is that far from condemning the principle and the practise of making compromises, we stated clearly that the choice of the lesser evil starts "from

sound common sense." We wrote: "The Church at all times and under all circumstances teaches the immutable sacred doctrine and moral principles which are contained in the divine law and divine revelation. On this point the Church does not admit any hesitation or any compromise." When we spoke of the "practical application, especially of moral principles, in which the Church is forced to adopt lower criteria of action," we were not speaking of *dogmatic* compromises but of *political* dealings, and obviously our remark applied only to *political* compromises. We knew that to "accept a great deal of the Reformation or of modern naturalistic rationalism" would have implied nothing less than to take immutable doctrinal and moral principles out of their shrine and trample them under foot. We knew and said that the Church does not admit in such matters any hesitation or compromises.

A compromise is not to be condemned owing to the sole fact that it is a compromise. A compromise which is made necessary by more or less unfortunate circumstances (hypothesis) though not as satisfactory as absolute good (thesis), is not worthy of blame in all cases. Case by case one has to see how much of the absolute good has been sacrificed and whether the positive advantages so obtained or the evil so avoided make up for the price which was paid.

We condemned in all cases those compromises which lead to active cooperation with evil. There are lines which no compromise is permitted to overstep. In dealing with this matter we followed closely Don Sturzo's own teaching in his article "Politique et Théologie Morale" (*Novelle Revue Théologique*, Sept.-Oct., 1938). In that article he stressed the point that "one of the absolute duties of Christian morals is to avoid cooperation with evil"; then he showed how low certain Catholic theologians had sunk in upholding or defending Nazism and Fascism; and finally he raised the question whether the Church in dealing with

governments which deny to their citizens all liberty to follow a Christian line of action, did not at least tacitly cooperate with evil. Following this theory, which is based on the tradition of Moral Theology and common sense and applying these principles to the dealings of the Vatican with the Fascist regime, we maintained that through its compromises with the Fascist dictatorship the Vatican has fallen precisely into the pit of cooperation with evil. Finally we remarked, following again Don Sturzo's thought, that "theoretical condemnations are not enough when the authority which condemns causes the people to cooperate with the evil that is condemned."

Here we come to Italy's affairs. Don Sturzo writes:

"In the case of the Italian Concordat (of February, 1929), the Church came to a particular collaboration with the Fascist State . . . But it is obvious that it was a religious and not a political collaboration, even if eventually it brought some advantages to Fascism which exploited such measures for its political purposes."

The matter is not as simple as that. There are features in that Concordat, such as the oath of allegiance to the regime to be taken by bishops and other holders of ecclesiastical benefices, the right of veto granted to the secular government against candidates to ecclesiastical offices and other provisions, which imply a remarkable degree of "political" and not merely religious collaboration. Last but not least, we must not forget that the Lateran agreements of 1929 included not only the Concordat, but also the Treaty which was essentially political, and the financial settlement by which the Holy See became the owner of one billion lire in bonds of the treasury of the Fascist State. We cannot understand how Don Sturzo can maintain that no political cooperation was implied by those agreements.

But it matters little whether the collaboration was religious or political. What does matter is that there was collaboration as a result of a compromise.

Is that compromise and such collaboration to be blamed?

We surmise that all in all Don Sturzo is not too far from agreeing with us on this point. In a recent article "The Roman Question before and after Fascism" (*The Review of Politics*, Oct. 1943) he writes: "From the viewpoint of history *the mistakes made by Pius XI* (italics ours) was in believing that after the liberal democratic experience of the Risorgimento, Italy could return to an authoritarian system already outdated, by means of the imposition of an armed party, Fascism." To this first a second mistake was added, if we are to accept what Don Sturzo writes in his discussion with us. This was "the idea of Pius XI of normalizing Fascism or influencing it either religiously or morally in order that it might become a factor of order in the country and in Europe as well." "Such a vision was based on premises that did not withstand the reality of facts." Now, the gist of the chapter, "The Vatican and Fascism" in our book was precisely our contention that the Vatican *made a mistake* and then blundering from mistake to mistake found itself irremediably enmeshed in the Fascist web. Since Don Sturzo has reached the same conclusion, it seems to us that we might take our hats off to each other and shake hands.

A large section of Don Sturzo's article is devoted to discrediting some statements of ours concerning the history of Don Sturzo's Party. With the authority which comes to him from the fact that he was the founder and the leader of that Party, he flatly contradicts us when we state that his Party "was handicapped in politics by special preoccupations about repercussions in high ecclesiastical circles." Don Sturzo tells us that the Vatican had "no relations either official or semi-official" with his Party, and he reminds us of the fact that "when the deputies of the Party caused the fall of the Nitti Cabinet (April 1920) the *Osservatore Romano* wrote a critical note against them; it was learned

that it was dictated by Cardinal Gasparri (the Secretary of State of Benoit XV) who had most friendly relations with Nitti; but this did not change the line of policy that the Party was following."

We submit that this evidence cuts both ways. It shows that the Papal Secretary of State felt it his right to pass judgment on the parliamentary activities of Don Sturzo's Party and to bring pressure to bear on it when its policies were disagreeable. If Cardinal Gasparri himself took a hand in the rebuke administered by the semi-official organ of the Vatican, this shows how heavy the pressure was. To be sure, Don Sturzo was not imposed upon by Cardinal Gasparri. This is to his credit. But does he think that other men of less strong character or more concerned with their own personal careers remained forever impervious to Vatican pressure?

Neither Pius XI nor Cardinal Gasparri were ever members of the National Directorate of Don Sturzo's Party. But "de jure" situations do not always coincide with "de Facto" situations. If the Party was "juridically" autonomous from ecclesiastical authorities, could its members "in actual facts" ignore the opinions of the ecclesiastical authorities? A man whom Don Sturzo well knows, Reverend Ernesto Varesi, described the ambiguous situation of the Party in the following terms:

"The fact that the Party professes not to be a Catholic Party does not change the fact that its strength mainly comes from the Catholic Church. If, therefore, on the assumption of its actually or potentially non-Catholic nature, its leaders should come to grips with the ecclesiastical authorities, many of the faithful would be forced to choose between their religious conscience and their party loyalty. They would choose the former . . . It is wise to act with extreme caution in matters where the ecclesiastical authority can, and perhaps must, have the last word. Thus, the non-religious nature of the Party must be taken with a grain of salt. Otherwise one can run up against some delusion . . . The Party would be inconceivable if there was not there the permission of the Holy See" (Varesi,

Il movimento cattolico italiano, pp. 183, 185, 290-1).

In other words, the Party remained autonomous as long as it did nothing which might displease the ecclesiastical authorities; but the day when the latter declared that they could no longer approve its work, it would find itself at the crossroads: either it had to renounce its autonomy and obey the ecclesiastical authorities, or to assert its autonomy and have trouble.

Let us recall a few facts. In August 1920 a political controversy between the right wing and the left wing of Don Sturzo's Party in the province of Bergamo came to a head. The clergy split up into two factions. The leader of the left-wing group priests, called together a meeting of the Federation of clergy. The Bishop of Bergamo forbade the meeting and enjoined parish priests to exclude from "all Catholic associations" those "false Catholic organizers" who still followed "the fatal rebellious movement." During those same days of August 1920, Cardinal Boggiani, Archbishop of Genoa, issued a pastoral letter to the clergy of his diocese, in which he forbade the associations recognized as Catholic by the ecclesiastical authorities, to affiliate themselves with Don Sturzo's Party; the deputies of this Party not only had no mandate from the Catholics, but "had shown that they did not possess the necessary qualifications to obtain legitimately and to carry out successfully such a mandate." During the Fall of 1920 the municipal elections were to take place all over Italy. The National Executive of the Party decided that the Party should nowhere ally with any other parties. On September 27-28, 1920, the *Osservatore Romano* warned the Catholics that, before it was too late, they should concern themselves with situations which, on account of complex moral and religious reasons, could not be dealt with from merely political and electoral standpoints. The paper invited the National Directorate of the Party "to an unimpassioned and free

examination of several local conditions." They should remember that "in comparison with higher interests, religious and civil, political interests, and party interests, especially in a moment of exceptional gravity, ought not to be sacrificed, but should be coordinated with those higher interests." In Milan the Catholic newspaper *Italia*, November 3, 1920, and a deputy enrolled in the Party, Nava, summoned the Catholics to vote for the "anti-Bolshevist" list. On November 5, 1920, the paper *La Perseveranza*, announced that "a very high ecclesiastical figure," in which everyone recognized the Archbishop of Milan, invited "whoever had at heart the real good of the city," to vote for the anti-Socialist coalition. In other words, while the National Directorate of the Party had decided upon a policy of non-coalition with other parties in the electoral campaign, the high ecclesiastical authorities, annulled that decision by urging the members of the Party to disown their leaders and to make coalitions with any anti-socialist group. Who was right or wrong in this case, matters little: what matters is the direct intervention of the ecclesiastical authority in the internal policies of the Party. Don Sturzo admits that by a circular of October 2, 1922, Cardinal Gasparri summoned all priests to withdraw from all parties. But he tells us that Gasparri "tried to disengage the clergy from the political parties" and that some secular and regular priests had joined the Fascist movement. So he leaves us free to think that Gasparri's circular was aimed at the Fascist Party. As a matter of fact *most* priests were members of Don Sturzo's Party. Gasparri's circular did not affect the Fascists in any noticeable measure. It did affect that huge majority of priests who from 1919 to 1922 had militated in Don Sturzo's Party and were now ordered to leave it in the lurch.

We have picked up no more than four facts. Whoever is in possession of

all available facts, will not be shaken by Don Sturzo's statements about the scanty number of priests who were delegates of the Party at the National Convention of April 1923 or held commanding positions in the local organizations. Don Sturzo does not say whether his figures are to be allotted to the period from 1919 to 1922, when the Party was blossoming, or to 1923 when it was undergoing a crisis of bewilderment and disorganization as a result of Fascist violence from without and Vatican maneuvers from within. The fact is that most of the 60,000 Italian priests and monks were, if not leaders, members of the Party from 1919 to 1922. Does Don Sturzo think that these people did not depend in any way on their bishops while sharing in the activities of the Party?

And what about Don Sturzo's resignation from the General Secretaryship of the Party in July 1923? Don Sturzo says that "this is not the place to tell about his resignation anymore than he did in his book *Italy and Fascism* . . . The rest must be left to future historians." With Don Sturzo's permission we will not leave to future historians what can be proved now by unimpeachable evidence.

In the Spring of 1923 a bill for an electoral reform was slated for discussion before the Lower House. In his *Italy and Fascism* Don Sturzo writes:

"The political atmosphere was sultry and oppressive. Black Shirts were concentrated in Rome. On every hand wild rumors circulated of violent outrages and personal vendettas; the armed forces of Fascism paraded in growing strength; even the galleries of the Chamber and its corridors and lobbies being thronged with them."

While the discussion was becoming more and more heated in the press, Cardinal Mistangelo, Archbishop of Florence, attended on June 19 a reception in honor of Mussolini; and to show that he was doing something more than attending a cold, official ceremony, he threw his arms around Il Duce's neck and kissed him. Then on June 25,

Monsignor Enrico Pucci, a man who was to be found everywhere in the Vatican without having any official status in it, and who claims to have been a longstanding friend and collaborator of Pope Pius XI, published an article in which he admonished Don Sturzo "not to go on creating embarrassment for the ecclesiastical authorities." Don Sturzo retorted that he did not need to take cognizance of opinions expressed by persons who had no legal status in the Catholic hierarchy; "he would only conform to clear instructions due to his lawful superiors." And behold, on July 11, he resigned the Secretaryship of his Party with the following declaration:

"I can no longer be a pretext, insidiously utilized, for misconceptions as to the relations between the People's Party and the Church, dragging this latter into political quarrels which the Party must meet on its own responsibility in complete independence. I therefore think it my duty to prevent without delay the attack against the Church from going further than ambushing and threats."

The Liberal newspaper, *La Stampa*, was more explicit than Don Sturzo:

"In the Vatican it was feared that Fascist hostility would spread to the clergy in general. High Fascist circles had warned the Vatican that it was impossible to safeguard any longer the person of Don Sturzo or the clergy in general in the different regions of Italy. The Vatican was alarmed by this state of things and since *Don Sturzo had previously offered to withdraw, should his person create difficulties for the Vatican, the latter let Don Sturzo know that the time had come for his resignation.* Don Sturzo at once sent in his resignation *which was first made known to the Vatican.*" (italics ours)

Il Popolo, the daily of the Party edited by a friend of Don Sturzo, reproduced in its issue of July 12-13, 1923, these words of *La Stampa* without any correction either from Don Sturzo or from the Vatican. Therefore we must consider that *La Stampa* gave a fair statement of the case.

Who were the "lawful superiors" to whose "clear instructions" Don Sturzo had to conform? They were the bishop

of Rome, i.e. the Pope, and the Cardinal Vicar, i.e. the acting bishop of Rome on behalf of the Pope.

Don Sturzo says that there were exaggerations and fairy tales about his resignation, and tells us that if he resigned from the General Secretaryship of the Party, he remained as a member of the National Directorate and Council of the Party, that he retired to the monastery of Montecanino at his own will, not at the Pope's order, and so on. But he knows as well as we, that his resignation, even stripped of fairy tales, made a tremendous impression. The Party "was shaken to its foundations."

"Despite all attempts to represent it [the resignation] as a voluntary act of purely personal significance, members, particularly clerics, believed that the Vatican had intervened, and deemed it prudent to withdraw from active support of the Party (Binchy, *Church and State in Fascist Italy* 151-153)."

This is the fact which matters and it should not be obscured by dealing with only exaggerations and fairy tales.

Don Sturzo states that in this case as in the whole of his life he "has given constant evidence that he has always safeguarded the political independence of his Party as well as the ecclesiastical discipline which binds him." He is right. In July 1923, by resigning he safeguarded the independence of his Party. But he was the commandant general who resigned his generalship in the midst of a great battle. While safeguarding the independence of his Party, he left the Party leaderless and bewildered. He could not do otherwise, if he had to safeguard the ecclesiastical discipline which bound him. This explains why nobody blamed him. Everybody realized that there was heroism in his self-sacrifice and not cowardice. But we do not need to leave future historians to decide that there was cowardice and not heroism in those "lawful superiors" who summoned a man who was under clerical discipline to sacrifice himself at the moment in that way.

We stated in our book that after the

Matteotti murder in September 1924, Pope Pius XI warned the Catholics that any alliance with the Socialists was forbidden by Catholic moral law. "By this intervention Pius XI sabotaged all negotiations for the coalition." Moreover "by order of the Vatican all priests were obliged to resign from the Party and give up all administrative and political positions which they held in the Catholic organizations. This meant the final disintegration of the Party."

Don Sturzo takes issue with these statements. In his opinion Pope Pius XI in making those pronouncements "considered an hypothesis that then had no ground for practical realization." Why then did Pius XI feel it incumbent upon him to make *just* that pronouncement at *just* that moment? Dr. Binchy, *Church and State in Italy*, p. 157-158, 162, will tell Don Sturzo that Pius XI, speaking to an audience of Catholic University students, warned them against "cooperation with evil" which evil was represented at that moment in Italy by the socialists.

"Never before had Pius XI given such unequivocal expression to his dislike and disapproval of the Popular Party, and although the supporters of the latter hastened to point out that he had not condemned the Party, they were unable to conceal their dismay . . . The Pope followed up his frontal attack by a circular to the bishops of Italy urging them to instruct their clergy to remain outside all political parties and, above all, to refrain from contributing to party newspapers of whatever colour . . . The intervention of Pius XI did not destroy the Popular Party, whose doom was already sealed by the consolidation of Fascist power, but it certainly gave it the *coup de grace* . . . No doubt the Vatican's benevolent attitude towards the destruction of the Popular Party had been largely based on the hope that its disappearance would eliminate the last excuse for friction between Fascism and the Catholic organizations of Italy."

Don Sturzo should debate this issue with Dr. Binchy rather than with us.

By way of conclusion, Don Sturzo holds that "the ire of Salvemini and La Piana is often out of season, and not

balanced," but it is psychologically comprehensible to him." Nevertheless, the truth must always be searched *sine ira et studio*—without anger and without partiality." We admit that throughout our book we used no gloves. Confronted with the greatest Italian catastrophe that history has ever witnessed, we thought that this was not the time for mellifluous

euphemisms or pontifical circumlocutions. Therefore we thank Don Sturzo for his psychological understanding. We hope that his comprehension will give him also an idea of the moral level of those among his American colleagues in the Catholic priesthood "whose only merit is their mastery in the acid of vituperation."

* * *

POWER POLITICS AND WORLD PEACE

(Editorial continued from page 9)

That this means inevitably a third world war is not absolutely certain. That it means a continued struggle between these ways of life is certain. But the struggle may be resolved without actual resort to arms. We do not say this is likely, but it is possible. If Soviet Russia continues to perform in peace as she has performed in war we may well see country after country swim into her orbit of power until that orbit becomes so great that the nations under the control of the private cartel system will hesitate to attack it. A period then of progress by adaptation may be upon us. The genius of the English is for political adaptation. England will be the key nation in the development of relations between Eurasia and the outer continental islands of the world. Churchill's England won't last forever. The Empire may burst into one last blaze of glory *as an empire*. A greater glory may await her as a bridge to a new day when peace shall be based less on power and more on justice.

Of course this is all conjecture, as of spectators at a game. Bleacher stuff. But we look at the game as players in the game, and there is no finer player than Dr. Das. For us the game is never in the bag, a foregone conclusion. Until time runs out we must fight on every front, everywhere on this planet, the fight against monopoly-imperialism, the anti-Fascist fight.

THIRD REICH GOES UNDERGROUND

By HEINZ POL

—The Nazi tiger turns into a purring house cat. Will the AMG feed him milk and stroke his fur?

WHILE THE representatives of Germany and those of the United Nations are quietly but steadily—though completely unofficially—intensifying their contacts, the Nazis and the Pan-Germans inside Germany are making their preparations for the Fourth Reich. During the last few weeks the British Intelligence Service has pointed out repeatedly that the Nazi Party is preparing to go underground as and when the Nazi regime breaks down. The underlying idea of this plan is that with the collapse of the Hitler regime Nazism in Germany will officially cease to exist, but that cells of loyal followers organized under various disguises will continue to remain in power, or at least close to power, in order to reappear on the surface at a given moment, though this moment may not be ripe until ten years after the conclusion of peace.

At first glance the idea of a Nazi underground movement seems fantastic. However, the reports of both the British Intelligence Service and various neutral observers are too well documented to be dismissed with a shrug of the shoulder. In addition, certain references in the Nazi press and a number of recent decrees make it fairly clear that the Nazi Party as well as the army are becoming increasingly convinced that the future has numerous chances to offer them if they only succeed in properly camouflaging and "reorganizing" themselves.

This "reorganization" is in full swing, and it is a most skillful operation. However, before we look at this process more closely it is necessary to examine the foundations of this Nazi plan. For

they contain the solution of a phenomenon which otherwise would be inexplicable, but which represents a terrible menace for the future.

The Nazi leaders and the representatives of the Pan-German elite, especially the army, are keen observers. Those among them who have realized long ago that the war is lost—and this applies to the overwhelming majority—are looking back to 1918 to find ways and means for an escape. And with even greater attention they are watching the activities of the United Nations, especially of England and the United States, in Italy. Authoritative sources in London and Washington have announced repeatedly that the present procedures of the AMG in Sicily and Southern Italy constitute, so to speak, a blueprint for the forthcoming occupation of Germany.

It may be useful to remember that, though after the first World War only the Rhineland was occupied by Allied troops, there existed nevertheless a kind of AMG in those days. The AMG of 1918/19, similar to the present AMG in Italy, acted along the basic principle of maintaining order and quiet and of suppressing all revolutionary trends. This theory was inspired by the fear that defeated Germany might become socialist or even bolshevistic and, therefore, a source of infection for the whole of Europe and, last but not least, for the Allied occupation troops.

The immediate practical consequence of this theory was that the AMG of 1919 in the Rhineland did everything to nip the German revolution in the bud. Revolutionaries were neither executed,

nor arrested; a much more effective method was applied: one took no notice of them. One ignored the fact that the German monarchy had become a republic, and that new political and social forces had come to the fore. All this the AMG of 1919 considered chaos which had to be suppressed. And one refused to deal with elements suspected of being "red."

There are reports about that period which in the Germany of today are studied just as thoroughly as they are being ignored in England and in the United States. These reports emanate from members of the AMG of that time, especially from high-ranking American officers, and they prove beyond any doubt that the Allies, in their fear of a real revolution, did everything to strangle the democratic development in the newly born German republic and thereby played into the hands of the new social democratic leaders in Berlin who also were not interested in a revolution.

The reports show that the AMG collaborated only with the "experienced and competent" German officials of the old regime. Colonel I. L. Hunt, Officer in Charge of Civil Affairs of the Third Army and the American Forces in Germany in 1919 reported:

"Most of the ex-imperial officers remained at their posts. In occupied territory their retention in office was made a condition of the armistice . . . The political institutions with which the American army came into contact during the occupation were, without exception, those of the old regime."

Hunt added significantly enough: "In many cases our arrival was welcomed by the officials, who regarded our coming as being of great assistance, enforcing their authority which had been weakened by the revolution."

The revolution of 1918 produced, among other factors, the phenomenon of the soldiers' and workers' councils, which had appeared actively for the first time during the Russian revolution in 1917. The formation of groups of revolutionary soldiers within the army, and of active workers within the industrial plants is an extremely effective organizational medium eminently fitted to carry out a political revolution simultaneously in every large and small community. Such councils are best organized to take over the local self-administration and from there to elect representatives for the state administration.

The system of councils is based on a fundamentally democratic principle, namely that of gradual election from below up to the very top of the state structure. This principle is certainly revolutionary as it takes into account the wishes and demands of the people directly and without bureaucratic intermediaries. But the creation of the council system does not mean that the rule of soldiers' and workers' councils at the beginning of a revolution must invariably lead to communism.

In the Germany of 1919 it would have led to socialism, with a government which would have swept away the representatives of the old powers, socialized the basic industries, thoroughly purged the universities, schools and law courts and distributed the immense estates of the Junkers among the small peasants. Such a government would have liquidated several thousand war criminals and would have dealt quickly with a few hundred nationalistic agitators, among them a certain Adolf Hitler of Munich.

One of the first decrees issued by the AMG of 1919 was to prohibit all soldiers' and workers' councils in the occupied Rhineland. By doing this, the Al-

lies gave the social democratic leaders in Berlin the opportunity to deal all the more ruthlessly with these councils and other revolutionary groups. "The Allied troops will otherwise occupy the whole of Germany," was the alarm spread by the new masters in Berlin. In this way they won over many progressive circles for their counter-revolutionary activities.

It is a historical fact that the social democratic leaders destroyed the revolution after the collapse of the German front. But they were effectively supported by the Allies who did not want a revolution, either. If the AMG of 1919 had insisted on dealing only with the representatives of the new regime, if it had not prevented every attempt of the German workers to occupy the factories in the Rhineland, the Weimar Republic would have scarcely degenerated into the Hindenburg regime and finally into the Third Reich.

The lessons which the Nazis and the Pan-Germans learned from the occupation of the Rhineland are further confirmed by what is happening in Italy today. Again, the AMG is collaborating with many representatives of the old regime. Again, for the sake of "order and quiet," the formation of revolutionary groups is either sabotaged or prohibited. Even an old-fashioned democrat like Sforza of whom one may say many things but certainly not that he is "red," is much too radical for the occupation authorities. In the villages, towns and provinces the medium, small and half-fascists are still governing.

It is, therefore, no wonder that the Nazis and Pan-Germans conclude that they will be needed once Germany is occupied. Not the most compromised ones, of course, not exactly the arch criminals, but enough officials and experts to rescue many thousands of loyal

followers of the "great idea" of Nazism for the future.

Already today they are working toward this aim. The underground cells which men like Himmler, Bormann (the successor of Hess) and munitions minister Speer, to name but a few, are presently creating, are to become a solid but invisible structure, recognizable only to the initiated.

According to the observations of the British Secret Service and other agencies, underground cells will be formed wherever this is least suspicious. This would be the case, for instance, within the police force, the municipal administration, and all welfare and relief organizations. The occupation powers—thus the Nazi underground organizers have figured out—will hardly turn for help to any formations of the German army even in case of popular upheavals, but they will be forced, to some extent, to collaborate with the German police. This does not mean the Gestapo or the Deathhead SS formations. But the German police is a large body and has many different sections. There are, for instance, the order police, the criminal police, and the rural police whose ranks are not exclusively composed of Nazi elements though supervised of course by Himmler.

The occupation powers—thus the Nazi underground organizers deduce from the experiences of 1919 and of present-day Italy—will sponsor and support the maintenance of these formations for reasons of expediency and to prevent revolutionary upheavals. Therefore, experienced "old fighters of the movement," especially older former SA and SS members who can be depended upon, are gradually being infiltrated into police formations in Germany. During the last few months, for instance, the rural police has increased considerably; the number of police sta-

tions in small towns and villages has doubled.

The increase in the police force is, of course, also intended to hold down as long as possible and by force the growing anti-war and anti-Nazi sentiments of the population. But at the same time one looks toward the future and creates within these police formations the small underground cells of SS men or Gestapo officials. In the moment of collapse these SS men and Gestapo officials would be liquidated; by giving a number of them harmless and unpolitical jobs, one can still rescue them.

The SS has always been the reservoir of undiluted Nazism. In its ranks served and still serve Hitler's elite; here was and still is formed—to use an expression of Himmler—the “new aristocracy” which is to rule Germany and the world. After the capitulation not much will remain of the various SS formations, from the Junker and riding schools to the guard units. They will be smashed. But there are other possibilities of rescuing the “spirit of the SS”: all one has to do is to eliminate smaller groups of SS men from their original formations and place them elsewhere. This is happening at the present time.

The SS has two reserve formations. Generally, each SS man, after at least twelve years' of active service, enters Reserve No. 1. During the course of the war the age limit was considerably raised so that comparatively few men over 35 years of age were discharged from active service. All the larger is Reserve No. II which comprises all SS men over 45 years so far as they are not used elsewhere on account of their rank.

Now the underground plan provides for small reliable groups of Reserve No. II to be placed with the various branches of the Civil Service, if possible in places where they can be of use after the war. There is the customs service,

there are the tax offices, there are the harmless departments of the municipal administrations such as the fire brigade, the welfare services and others. All these offices will, no, they *must* continue to function no matter how long Germany is occupied.

The formation of underground cells is not limited to the one hundred per cent Nazis. The army, too, begins to place its people in safe positions. Older officers and those unfit for front line service are made organizers of civilian formations, especially welfare institutions like the Red Cross. They are sent as “consultants” into factories where, for the time being and until the big thunderstorm has blown over, they will quietly sit at some desk of any commercial or technical department and won't budge.

Keep quiet and don't budge—this is the slogan for the underground cells which are now being formed,—work quietly for “peace and order” and make yourself indispensable. Presumably the Nazi underground cells will work separately and without contact immediately after the collapse of the regime in order to win the confidence of the occupation authorities. Later on, the loosely working organization is to be gradually centralized, first region by region, and finally covering the entire territory of the future Germany.

One may object that the whole underground plan of the Nazis is senseless since the leaders who can put it into practice can never live to see their Fourth Reich. On the other hand, many members of the Nazi upper crust are still convinced that they can escape final punishment by fleeing abroad at the last minute, preferably to South America. Secondly, it must be remembered that the organizers of the underground plan are people who, like Himmler, are driven by a morbid fanaticism: they

really believe in the lasting values of their ideas, regardless of whether they themselves will perish or not.

And many Pan-Germans, above all the representatives of the army, think along similar lines. If they succeed—as they did after 1918—in sending thousands of younger officers as “students” to the universities and later to place them in various professions; if, in one word, they succeed in preserving a social nucleus of the officers class, then, in ten or at the latest twenty years, they will again be in the saddle.

The underground plans of the Nazis and the Pan-Germans can be destroyed only if the German masses will carry out a political, economic and social revolution in Germany either in the course of, or immediately after the collapse of the Third Reich. As there is no doubt that Germany will be occupied by the armies of the United Nations, such a revolution cannot be prepared—and certainly not be carried out—without the tacit approval of the AMG. But there are many indications that the United Nations desire nothing less than a German revolution.

In his Christmas message President Roosevelt indicated that the United States, Great Britain and Russia have agreed on a common political line concerning the fate and future of Ger-

many. He said: “. . . we intend to rid them once and for all of Nazism and Prussian militarism and the fantastic and disastrous notion that they constitute the ‘Master Race’.”

In order to reach this goal, Germany must not only be destroyed militarily, but the German people must rid themselves of their economic and cultural elite, for this elite is the breeding ground for militarism, racism, and imperialistic megalomania.

This step can only be accomplished by means of a revolution. No other method will be adequate: neither the mass punishment of the war criminals; nor the long-term occupation of Germany; nor the employment of millions of German workers for the reconstruction of Europe. All of this cannot replace the revolution. All of this cannot prevent the Nazis and Pan-Germans from going underground, that is, from preparing the next war.

On December 19, 1943, the *New York Times* wrote: “In the past two months the general director of the I. G. Farben, Hermann Schmitz, on behalf of Dr. Schacht, communicated with his Lisbon friends, and they got in touch with New York bankers in the interests of peace.”

Such contacts, if they continue, augur well for the new Nazi underground and bigger and better wars to come.

* * *

“I am forced by pressure of evidence to the conclusion that the democratic and cultural heritage of the modern English-speaking world is much more a spiritual than a political or an economic achievement . . . and that the Evangelical Revival, which was the heir of Puritanism was the true nursing mother of the spirit and character values that have created and sustained free institutions throughout the English-speaking world.”

J. W. BREADY in “England Before and After Wesley”
quoted in “Restoration Puritanism” by
Harry Grant Plum, Chapel Hill

CLERICALISM IN NEW ZEALAND

By JOHN A. LEE

—In New Zealand the Catholic working man is a sturdy democrat, the Catholic soldier a democratic one, despite the clerical press.

CLERICAL Fascists exist in New Zealand but they are a small minority of our people. The Roman Catholic community is assessed in the census at 13% of our population and no doubt the Church would consider itself fortunate if 50% of the census number were regular communicants. At that they would be more alive than other religions for although New Zealand is well supplied with non-conformist ministrations and has no shortage of churches it may be doubted whether the average attendance on any Sunday exceeds 5% of the census attestation.

A soldier writing to me from camp a week ago assured me that he had counted church parade on a recent Sunday when the parade was voluntary and not more than 5% paraded.

Non-Conformism Strong

Non-conformism has always been powerful in New Zealand. Canterbury in the South Island was colonised originally by the Anglican church, Otago by the Presbyterian. There was no major Roman Catholic settlement and apart from one or two minor localities there are no centres of preponderant Roman Catholic population density. Political non-conformism has always been powerful in New Zealand as much among the Roman Catholic elements as elsewhere. Our Roman Catholic community, derived from Ireland during times of great economic distress and embittered by the Home Rule controversy, were as sturdily progressive in regard to land and labour legislation as were the Presbyterians with

their memories of hardship in Scotland's cities and of evictions from Highland crofts. Although I have heard my mother tell of early street fights in some southern towns on St. Patrick's and on the Orangeman's day there has been a complete absence of such conflict during my memory. Education was early made secular, and the Roman Catholic minority at great pains and sacrifice built up their own school system. Two early New Zealand Premiers, Sir Robert Stout and John Ballance were openly presidents of the Rationalist Association, the late Premier M. J. Savage was a self-confessed rationalist during the active years of his life although he was converted to Roman Catholicism during his last sickness, and the present Prime Minister in one of his first Parliamentary speeches refers to himself as a rationalist.

Roman Catholic Radicals

Roman Catholics have been prominent in the radical movements and a recent Premier of New Zealand, Sir Joseph Ward, was a practicing Roman Catholic as is the present Deputy Premier Mr. Sullivan. It would be true to say that there has been no sustained dominance of New Zealand politics by any religious block although there have been efforts which have ended in frustration. Sir Joseph Ward was associated with a government which was the first in the world to enfranchise women, to pay a pension to the aged, a government which forty years ago had legislated to provide Advances for Housing and for Land Settlement, a

Public Trustee, State Fire, Life and Accident Insurance. The Roman Catholics were undoubtedly loyal as voters to Sir Joseph Ward, Roman Catholic, but loyal because of their radical tradition as well as because of their Roman Catholic faith. New Zealand at an early period in her history had socialist foundations, water power with the state as wholesaler and the municipality as retailer, State and municipal transport, a State Post and Telegraph Dept., the government the largest shareholder in the largest bank, and Sir Joseph Ward had a share in all this with Irish radical support.

Protestant Political Association

Towards the end of Sir Joseph's career as Prime Minister there came into existence a Protestant Political Association which hotly attacked the Premier alleging he favoured Roman Catholics and the Roman Catholic Church. This non-conformist body, the core of which would be the Loyal Orange Lodge and therefore largely recruited from anti-Home Rulers, apart from its campaign against Sir Joseph Ward was associated with conservatism in politics, a position which finally destroys any non-conformist organization. The reason for the conservatism may have been Sir Joseph Ward's past progressivism, of which at the height of PPA activity he had already divested himself. There was another reason. The PPA flourished during the 1914-1918 war and its aftermath in which the emerging Labour Party, now the governing force in New Zealand politics had a history of pacifism and defeatism which contrasts strangely with their whole-hearted resistance to Nazi Fascism today. Thus we had the Irish Catholic vote (radical) and the non-conformist vote (reactionary) in politics, although, the non-conformist community being more sturdily

loyal to the Allies in the war against Kaiserism. For a moment the PPA became a great power. It filled the largest halls with its meetings and its candidates won a majority support in Parliament and on municipalities. The very fact of the PPA attack on Sir Joseph Ward had the negative effect of causing the Irish radical to remain loyal to Ward rather than transfer his vote to the rising Labour Party, and in 1928 a vote, to no small extent religious, had the effect of setting back Labour's fortunes and of giving the now completely reactionary and sick Ward the Prime Ministership. The main Roman Catholic vote followed Ward from radicalism to reaction.

Meanwhile the non-conformist PPA as with all Protestant activity based on reaction fell from grace and virtually disappeared, the very basis of non-conformism being surely the eternal emergence of new revelation, religious and political, for just as democracy is finally incompatible with the authoritarian Roman Church, so is reaction completely destructive of the dynamic of non-conformism. Non-conformism dies in any prison it makes of society. Thus passed temporarily away a force which allied to radicalism could have assisted profoundly in social regeneration. Ward failed and the way was open for the forward march of Labour which now tended to deny any rationalist associations and seek the support of parson and priest.

The Depression

When did radicalism start to wane among the hierarchy? In New Zealand the hierarchy is of Irish descent. Association with Labour Socialism was natural while labor, allied with Liberalism, was standing against conservatism for Home Rule but between De Valera's medievalism and Irish labour a rift grew up. Labour's historic attitude towards Home Rule was gov-

erned by the belief that given Home Rule Irish working men would turn their minds to social betterment but partition gave the reactionaries and clericals such a devil as Hitler found in the Jews. Partition became the origin of every sin of commission and omission. The medievalist had partition to crucify for his own sins. A further change came with the stabilizing of the Russian Revolution, the rise of Italian Fascism, the signing of the Lateran Treaty. Environment had made the earlier priest a rebel, a democrat. A new race of young Catholics was growing up, sons of wealthy parents in some instances. Some of these young men started to return from Rome more coloured with Fascist than with democratic philosophy. The change came gradually. During the depression years which swept Hitler into power New Zealand knew great distress and parson and priest frequently took the platform to denounce social injustice. When the Arbitration Court (which for years had fixed wages) was abolished, leaving workers to scramble for jobs at the market price of human flesh, when hundreds of thousands were unemployed, the ruling wage being fixed by the least scrupulous employer, the clergy of all persuasions raised voices of protest and none more courageously than the Catholic Bishop of Auckland. Nevertheless a change was occurring, not so much in regard to local as in regard to foreign politics but the change was more one of emphasis than of philosophy, I can see now.

The Catholic Press

I only realized the full extent of the change when I started to carefully examine the Library files of Roman Catholic papers recently. Gradually Mussolini becomes more and more acceptable as he pays more of the contract

price in money and in Italy's freedom to the Vatican. The full price paid Mussolini is never opposed, political denunciation being directed always towards Mexico, Russia. China is denounced as Communist and Japan is applauded for encouraging the Vatican type of Christianity. When Viennese working men are shot down and democracy in Austria is destroyed by the pocket thug Dolfuss the Social Democrats are pictured as scum and the inquisitors of Dolfuss as everything that Catholics should be. We are assured that Dolfuss is building a Catholic Corporate state on the Vatican model, a model which by the way, in Spain, Portugal, Vichy France, Italy, Austria and Slovakia seems very much like a restoration of the sewer-like Papal corruption ended by Garibaldi. The readers of the Roman Catholic press are not told that apart from the wholesale murder of democrats about the one achievement of Dolfuss was to end the religious reformation by basing work in the civil service upon membership of the Roman Catholic faith, hunger being as coercing but not so likely to evoke foreign hostility as the pile of faggots. When Mussolini goes to war on Abyssinia, Mussolini is befriended, the League of Nations is slandered. When Mussolini goes to war on Spain aided with the dynamite of foreign finance and the fervour of Moors, the workingmen democrats of Spain are again denounced as scum. This re-emergence of the Spanish Inquisition in the person of Franco is applauded. Again we are assured that Franco with Vatican blessing is butchering his way towards the Christian Corporate State.

Thus *Zealandia* Jan. 14, 1937: "Franco has taken his place in that group of Christian Colonial Officers, the pride of civilized Europe."

On Jan. 28, 1937 rebuking the

Trades and Labour council for its attitude towards Spain *Zealandia* says: "The Trades and Labour Council may or may not see the logical implications of its resolution to organize relief and assistance for Spanish workers. But it is to be hoped Catholic workers will not mistakenly allow themselves to be drawn into any proposals which under cover of sympathizing with what is wrongly described as the workers' bonafide fight for justice, would in reality be supporting the attempt to establish a Communist State in Spain."

Sectarianism as a Weapon

The above quotation is typical of the paper, the effort to use the regimentation of religion to justify a political crime. The labour movement was anti-Franco but because of old friendships and fears of a regimented anti-labour vote discreetly so. *The Tablet*, Dunedin, produced a letter to the Catholic President of the Labour Party, Mr. James Roberts, himself openly anti-Franco, opposing his attitude. This was the world tactic, the voting power of the church threatened against politicians to disarm active support of democratic movements in Austria, Spain, in Italy and Portugal. Some Labour MPs openly took the platform to denounce Francoism, particularly three of the younger men, Ormond Wilson, Dr. McMillan and W. J. Lyon who has been killed since in the present war. *Zealandia* hastened to intimidate these democrats and said on July 29, 1937 in a letter headed "Labour and Communism":

"We have the sorry spectacle of labour members of Parliament publicly inaugurating and supporting movements that have their inspiration in subversive milieus. One of these movements is the Spanish Medical Relief, sponsored chiefly by a Doctor McMillan who can hardly be ignorant of the

fact that this is just part of the Communist Emotional Propaganda campaign. We have had labour members appearing on public platforms in connection with a solidarity day upholding the Communists in Spain. An ordinary sense of prudent reserve in such circumstances might reasonably have been expected from those who have the responsibility of acting as the people's representatives in Parliament."

The above is always the pattern. The dictator is a saint, Franco is the architect of the Christian Corporate Order favoured by the Vatican. Those who support democracy in Spain are denounced as Communist.

Holy Lying

There is any amount of lying. Today, of course, we know that German airmen have boasted of the way Hitler's bombs obliterated Guernica as Hitler and Mussolini used Spanish democrats as guinea pigs for their murder rehearsals. The clericalist press states, August 21, 1938: "Guernica was not destroyed by bombs from foreign planes in the service of Franco. It was razed by the retreating Reds by dynamite and incendiarism, with the deliberate sacrifice of life, so they discredit the nationalists in the eyes of the nations." On such drivel were the gullible fed.

When the Czechoslovak crisis occurs the clericalist press again are against the democrats. They are careful not to approve Hitler but they are reckless in their denunciation of Czechoslovak democracy. Thus on September 15, 1938 in a leader on Russia and British policy *Zealandia* said: "The extremist element in the British Labour Movement has seized upon every excuse to force Britain into a war with the anti-Communist nations. Abyssinia, Spain and China were each made

a handle for the war mongers, and now Czechoslovakia supplies grounds for a further agitation. It will be observed that in every situation in which British representatives have urged open intervention or other material assistance then sympathies have been decided less by the merits of the case than by a confirmed hostility to the anti-Communist forces in Europe."

The above paragraph reflects the regular attitude. Japan is always preferred to China, Franco is a saint and democratic Spain is the Communist devil, Salazar in Portugal is clad in saintliness because of his religion even if his is only a ruthless reactionary dictatorship.

On September 29, 1938 *Zealandia* said, "Russia has been determined to keep Czechoslovakia in a state of seething discontent that would invite the intervention of other nations to protect their maltreated minority peoples, and thus perpetrate the perpetual discord that is essential to the Soviet's plan".

Reverting to September 15, 1938 we again read, "The Czechs represent the Communist ideal in opposition to German Totalitarianism".

Every democracy threatened by Hitler, Mussolini or Franco is dubbed Communist.

One Pattern

Thus for the *Osservatore Romano* to *Zealandia*, the clericalist press conformed to a pattern. China was Communist, Japan safeguarded and encouraged Christian missions, Franco Spain was building a Christian corporate state, Republican democratic Spain alleged to be building hell, thus December 2, 1937 headlines "With the Lid Off—A Look into Red Spain—Hell upon Earth". Mexico was always labelled anti-Christ and Portugal always ideally Christian. Mussolini's

campaign against Abyssinia was staunchly apologized for, the attitude of the League of Nations "dominated by Russia". The Popular Front government in France because of its anti-Fascist attitude was dubbed Communist always. For months *Zealandia* ran a series of articles on the Corporate state by Major Barnes, the British Fascist who now abuses British democracy from the Rome radio. In these at great length Barnes set out to establish that the Fascist States of Italy and Portugal were cast in the pattern of the Pope's Encyclicals. It is scarcely believable that articles openly espousing Fascism could have appeared in a New Zealand paper, in a paper which in foreign policy always favoured Mussolini, Franco, appeasement and abused Czechoslovakia for its Communism.

The War

At last came the war. The beasts had won half Europe by blackmail and were now tearing the rest to pieces with a ferocity and animalism never equalled in history. *Zealandia* supported the allied war. But it was a strange support. There were poems of praise for DeValera and his policy of neutrality. About this time I started to run a small sheet *Lee's Weekly*. The constant praise of Franco, Salazar, DeValera at a time when we were fighting for democracy angered me. I wrote an article "To Hell with Friends of Franco." *Zealandia* promptly dubbed me anti-Catholic on the eve of an election. The election was postponed but I did not bend the knee to the political intimidation. Why should I bend the knee. I set about an attack on the clerical Fascists which I have not relaxed unto this day. I soon discovered from contact and correspondence that I had the warm support of a huge number of democratic Catholics, particularly

those in uniform, who are as brave and zealous as any other section of the community in their adherence to democracy, and who resented the Fascist line of their clerical press as much as I did myself.

When democratic France fell there was such a howl of glee over the downfall of liberty, fraternity, equality as to disgust any democrat profoundly. The "Fall of the Bastille" was sneered at, the "arch criminal Voltaire" was assailed. The doddering old anti-democrat Petain was hailed as the builder of a new Christian Corporate State although everyone knew that he was only reverting France to the evil days of before the French Revolution.

Russia

What a snarl went up from *Zealandia* when Hitler marched against Russia and when Winston Churchill declared immediate and whole-hearted support. Said *Zealandia*, no doubt following the line of the same press the world over: "To aid Soviet Russia even against our common foe is to invite the curse of God upon ourselves. To those who say that Germany's victory over Russia means our defeat, we would say it is better to go down in honour, because of our allegiance to God, than to stand victorious in the world after selling ourselves to the devil".

This certainly was strong language. Later Russia's neutrality with Japan was roundly abused by the *Zealandia* which had spurned Russia's aid.

Let me conclude by saying that the clerical Fascist line is not influential in New Zealand. It has been more notable for its success in imposing press censorship than for any success in provoking defeatist political policies. The Catholic elements of our army are beyond reproach as soldiers and democrats. There are signs of resentment at the tone of much *Zealandia* political philosophy and in that paper an increasing concentration on New Zealand and its problems. Spain these days is scarcely mentioned, DeValera no longer praised for his neutrality, Vichy France receives much less mention, an odd note of approbation of Russia creeps in, although a couple of weeks ago an article in praise of Portugal talked of "people who had no talent for self-government".

In New Zealand the Catholic working man is a sturdy democrat, the Catholic soldier a democratic one, despite the clerical press. The New Zealand people are more heavily involved in this war from the point of manpower sacrifice than any nation outside of Europe. No defeatist government could be formed in New Zealand. If clerical Fascist propaganda as we have shown did exist here in its classical form its results in undemocratic action have been nil.

* * *

It should be remembered that the impetus which was to revolutionize and modernize religion had come from Puritanism, the application of faith in God to man's relation to his fellows. The social application had to wait a century's development, but the Puritan had made it clear that there could be no turning back from the course.

—from "Restoration Puritanism"
... by Harry Grant Plum, Chapel Hill

WHAT TO DO ABOUT SPAIN?

By LAWRENCE FERNSWORTH

THOSE WHO stabbed the Spanish Republic in the back, know—none better—that it has not been destroyed and that the day of its resurgence will come sooner or later. This explains their rancor when they discuss the question of Spain and their persistence in spreading the falsehoods about the "Godliness" of Franco and the "communistic" character of the Spanish Republic, which in fact was so little communistic that it had not even established diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union although all the great powers on earth, including our own, had done so. It explains, one may be sure, those statements of Archbishop Spellman which right-minded men have found so shocking.

The question, "What to do about Spain?", is as vital as the question, "What to do about Italy?—or about Germany?"

The story of our own government's disastrous handling of the Spanish question is well known. We know that if we had permitted the Spanish Republic to import from us arms for her self-defense that action would have been an important factor in carrying the day against the military, clerical, Fascist set-up bent on strangling it.

But when a group of clergymen and others called on the President to urge such action the President replied that to do so would serve no purpose since the Fascists would not allow arms to reach Spain anyhow.

The Spanish Republican government, which surely should have known something about that, did not think so. They merely asked permission to buy arms here and to take them away from our ports. They were satisfied to do the

worrying about how to get them to Spain.

Yet our distinguished President, it seemed, preferred to invoke his anxiety about a problem that did not concern him as an excuse for retreating before a problem that ought to have concerned him very much.

Aside from the question of arms themselves, our lifting the embargo would have been of the greatest importance in two respects, that is: *in pulling Spain out of the international whirlpool that was sucking her down, and in establishing our moral leadership in the world drive to Democracy.*

At that time France still hesitated to open the frontier and let arms go through to the loyalists. At this time especially the lifting of the embargo by our government would have strengthened the wavering arm of France. And we may certainly suppose that the Spanish Republican government which, under such nearly insuperable difficulties, had still managed to procure arms for defense, might, finding a free market in our country, also have found a way for getting those arms across her borders, even though the bulk of them might not have come through her ports. The ports and the vessels of some other European country or countries, as is well known, might have served for that purpose.

Our action would, at the same time, have had the effect of serving notice on England that we did not go along with her in her poorly concealed policy of helping the totalitarian countries to strangle Republican Spain. And the Britain which was even then engaged in throwing democratic Spain into the maw of the European Fascists, as it soon

was to throw Czechoslovakia into that same maw, would have received a decisive diplomatic setback. Who can tell? *Such a check on appeasement might well have averted that shamefulfulness of Munich.*

We are now told by certain publicists at Washington that our government wishes to withdraw from the Spanish imbroglio because of the headaches involved. But mere retreat isn't enough.

A negative policy toward a country whose people have looked, and still look to us for aid in a struggle so similar to that which we as a young nation underwent, is not good enough. Only a positive policy toward Spain will repair the injury inflicted upon her.

If the announced aim of our war leaders, to destroy Fascism, means anything, then it certainly means that it is our job to undo the Fascism we allowed to establish itself in Spain.

What is more, we owe this thing to ourselves as a commonsense measure of security, for it is vital to our national security that no plague spot of Fascism exist anywhere in Europe. This particular plague spot, as we know, strikes directly at us through Latin America.

Franco Spain has been our enemy in an undeclared war from the time that Germany and Italy invaded Spain when the European phase of the Second World War started.

Franco Spain has helped and continues to help our enemies in many ways. As a pseudo-neutral it has been far more useful to the enemy than it could have been had it taken up arms against us.

Shall anyone say that Spain's undeclared war upon us, which by now is so much a part of contemporary history that it seems unnecessary again to recite the facts of it, is any less brazen than was Germany's undeclared war on our

shipping, for which we broke off relations with it?

Notwithstanding this plain glaring fact, those same occult forces that stayed our arm when it seemed poised to aid the Republic have stayed it again in this war.

It is just as much in order, notwithstanding, that our government and our allies act toward Spain in a manner compatible with our security and with the interests of democracy as it was in order during the Spanish Civil War to demand that we give Spain that friendly aid that is due between sister republics.

During the Spanish Civil War Mr. Churchill told me in London that he believed the monarchy to be the only solution in Spain, and in the back of his mind one may be sure that this thought still lingers. Is this view also harbored in Washington?

The notion that a monarchy is the only government suitable for Spain is part of the mythos that has been assiduously created by the enemies of the true Spain. Whenever there has emerged constitutional or popular government in Spain's past those enemies have set out systematically to sabotage it so as to make their libel on the Spanish people seem true. And this was particularly the case with the Spanish Republic which drew its first breath on April 14, 1931.

I witnessed the birth of that Republic and with what high hopes it set forth. I observed the enemy coming out of ambush. The years from 1931 to 1936 were filled with turbulent events in which the Republic battled its enemies from all sides.

Only when *la niña*—the baby—as Spaniards affectionately called it, seemed to have proved its ability to survive, did its enemies set out to strangle it once and for all with the aid of invaders.

According to Alvarez del Vayo,

Spain's former foreign minister: "The idea of restoration is pure insanity. Except for a small group of the old nobility, the big landowners, who hated the agrarian reforms of the Republic, and the Catholic hierarchy, the monarchy has no support." (*The Nation*, Nov. 20)

Mr. del Vayo argues for the restoration of the legitimate republican government under the constitution. I observed the making of that constitution, analyzed and cross-analyzed it. It was an excellent constitution with every safeguard against dictatorship except in the eventuality against which no constitution can guard, namely, of rebellion and war.

When the presently impending Spanish crisis breaks the first move of free-

dom loving Spaniards, one may be sure, will be to set up a provisional government. This they did in 1931 in the crisis that followed the downfall of the monarchy. It was this provisional government that brought forth the republican constitution after eight months. We must at once recognize that provisional government and give it every facility, even to those arms we once denied Spain, to fight its own battle for freedom. It is only by such forthright action that we can regain that moral world leadership now so lamentably compromised. The first victory of Fascism and Nazism in this war—gained in Spain—must be undone. And until it is completely undone, until every trace of fascist totalitarianism is obliterated in Spain, this war will not have been ended.

* * *

"It is sad that at this moment a simple priest must be the one to appeal to Catholics when there are so many bishops who though they have always condemned war have placed themselves on the side of the powerful. God placed power in our hands, leadership and education and with these means at our command why did the people desert the Church? Don't blame it on Russian propaganda. Nobody had better means of propaganda than we had. If the people fled the Church it was because they saw the church's union with the Caciques (political bosses who maintain the domination of the landlords). Why were there two chapels in the religious schools, one for the poor children and the other for the rich? We cannot do less than protest when millions of pesetas are discovered in the palaces of the bishops while the poor perish of hunger, beg alms or go to gather the leavings of the meals in the barracks? A cross of two sticks, a threadbare cassock and a tin ring would have sufficed to permit a bishop to fulfil his function. The hatred of the people is not directed against God nor at the Church; it is turned toward their ministers."

This priest concluded with a dramatic challenge to his bishops: "You are sending through Europe the rumor that Communist and socialist mobs have seized our land and that Spain is a country in ruin. That is a lie: you spit at Heaven and the spit falls back in your face."

FATHER JUAN GARCIA MORALES

quoted in McGovern's "Why the Bishops Back Franco"

MOSCOW-CAIRO-TEHERAN

By TARAKNATH DAS

—My conclusions are gloomy.

AFTER THE foreign ministers of the U. S. A., Britain and Russia met at Moscow, at which time a general agreement on urgent issues of the war was arrived at, it was decided that the heads of these powers should meet and carry on further discussions. This meeting took place in the Soviet Russian Embassy in Teheran (Iran) a few weeks later. It is significant that although Iran is a member of the United Nations her existence as an independent power and ally was virtually ignored.

Before this meeting at Teheran the Anglo-American leaders and their staffs got together at Cairo without the Russians. It is clear now that the prime objective of this meeting was to have closer Anglo-American solidarity and agreement on world issues.

Marshal Chiang Kai-Shek was invited to this Cairo Conference to give the impression to the world that there was such a thing as Anglo-American-Chinese solidarity and to prevail upon Chiang to accept the British program for the re-establishment of British Imperialism in East Asia, Burma, Malaya, and Hongkong, French Imperialism in Indo-China, Dutch Imperialism in the Dutch East Indies and Anglo-American control of the mandated Pacific Islands which are now under Japanese control. Also Marshal Chiang agreed not to meddle in Britain's "private" affairs in India.

Marshal Chiang cannot hold his own in China without Anglo-American financial, political and military aid. He cannot expect wholehearted support from Soviet Russia, because she is interested in the ascendancy of Chinese Commu-

nists. Thus Chiang had to surrender politely to Anglo-American dictation.

The declaration of the Cairo Conference made much of the ultimate objective of stripping Japan of her conquests, Manchuria to go back to China; Formosa and other islands occupied by Japan also to China; but no mention of China recovering Hongkong, acquired by Britain in her Opium War! "*In due course of time*," when fit for self-government, Korea would be given her freedom. No mention as to who would decide about Korean fitness. Koreans in China—members of the Korean Government-in-Exile at Chungking—have expressed, according to a *New York Times* dispatch, bitter resentment.

It is interesting that while the declaration of the Teheran Conference speaks of respecting the independence and sovereignty of Iran, the Iranian Cabinet has resigned, after stating that Iran is being treated now not as a free nation, but as an occupied country.

Just as during World War I, the whole of the Near East was divided into spheres of influence between France and Britain by the (secret) Sykes-Picot Agreement, is it not conceivable that after the elimination of France from Syria the whole Near East may be divided into Anglo-American and Soviet Russian spheres of influence?

While this was going on Jan Smuts, Prime Minister of South Africa, who presided over British Cabinet meetings during the absence of Churchill and Eden from London, told the world what Britain should do to maintain her position as a great power. Smuts said that

after the complete defeat of Germany and Japan, there will remain only three Great Powers—the Americans, the Russians, and the British. Of these Russia will be the most powerful nation in Europe and Britain will be the weakest of the three. He pointed out that Russia had already begun to increase her influence by signing treaties of alliance with Central European Powers; Britain to counteract the increasing Russian Power, should form alliances with the small powers of western Europe and form defensive alliances with the Scandinavian countries, Holland, Belgium, and Spain as well as Portugal, thus creating a new balance of power against Russia.

Less than two weeks later it was reported in the *New York Times* that an important person close to the Belgian Government-in-Exile in London made a proposition that Belgium may become a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, under certain conditions. If this becomes a fact Britain will have the right to use military bases in Belgium, one of the most important strategic centres in Europe; furthermore Belgium as a part of the British Empire will allow Britain control of the Belgian African colonies—Belgian Congo, etc.—for raw materials and control of Africa.

Britain is doing her best to reinstate a monarchy in Spain with Queen Victoria's great-grandson Juan, now an officer in the British navy, as the future king of Spain. This would bring Spain into Britain's orbit.

It is needless to add that Portugal, the oldest ally of Britain in Europe is virtually a British protectorate, and Portugal will be a part of a British system of which General Smuts has so candidly spoken.

It should be noted that these British moves regarding Belgium and Spain have come to light *after* the Moscow,

Cairo and Teheran conferences have taken place and *after* the signing of a 20-year treaty of alliance between Soviet Russia and the Czech Government and also *after* the Anglo-American Powers recognized the dominant position of Marshal Tito and his government in Yugoslavia which is under Soviet Russian influence.

These facts clearly indicate that the world is being divided into Soviet Russian and Anglo-American spheres of influence and a new balance of power is in formation.

After World War I, Britain, France, and the U. S. A. signed a treaty of alliance as a protection to France in case of another German attack. But the U. S. Senate refused to ratify this alliance and Britain fearful of the then growing power of France in continental Europe, gave up the alliance. To bring about a new balance of power in Europe British statesmen began to aid Germany against France aided by the anti-French Fascist Italy of Mussolini (until Mussolini and Laval agreed to form a combination in the Mediterranean and North Africa which challenged British supremacy in these regions), aided the anti-French and anti-Russian Nazi-Germany of Hitler, until Sir Nevil Henderson's Mission (for an Anglo-German alliance on England's terms) failed.

If we take Smuts seriously, then Britain will try to check the growing power of Russia (as she did after the Napoleonic War and on other occasions). In that case Germany will be sought after both by the Anglo-Americans and by Russia, which will try to bring about a Franco-German-Russian understanding. This United Europe under Russian leadership would be opposed by Britain. This will not make for peace.

In the coming rivalry between the Anglo-Americans and Russia the sup-

port of China and India will be wooed by both groups, and unless the Anglo-Americans change their attitude to Asian aspirations to freedom Russia will win out in this wooing.

My conclusions are gloomy. The Mos-

cow-Cairo-Teheran Conferences were held to devise means of defeating Germany and Japan dividing the world into spheres of influence. This will within a quarter of a century or earlier lead to another World War.

* * *

TEACHINGS THAT DIVIDE

"Whatever deflects from our own consciences the penetrating glance of God by making a scape-goat of the Jews or any other race, must be stricken from our teaching and from our texts."

Excerpt from the pledge in support of THE PROTESTANT TEXTBOOK COMMISSION, signed by 2,907 Ministers.

"Pilate, seeing the pitiable condition to which Jesus was reduced, thought the sight of Him would appease *the malice of the Jews*. For this reason he led the Son of God out on a high balcony and, presenting Him in all His misery, said, 'Behold the Man.' But the *barbarous, bloodthirsty people* only cried out the more, 'Crucify Him, crucify Him.'"

Page 208, *Bible History*, by Bishop Richard Gilmour, published by Benziger Bros., New York, N. Y.

"For eighteen hundred years *has the blood of Christ been upon the Jews*. Driven from Judea—without country, without home—strangers among strangers—hated, yet feared—have they wandered from nation to nation, *bearing with them the visible signs of God's curse. Like Cain, marked with a mysterious sign, they shall continue to wander till the end of the world.*"

Page 209, *Bible History*, by Bishop Richard Gilmour.

"The Jews have a dreadful account to give to God; they persecuted the prophets, they crucified the Savior, they put to death the apostles . . ."

Page 232, *Bible History*, by Bishop Richard Gilmour.

Benziger Brothers, Inc., Publishers, advertise Gilmour's *Bible History* as follows: "In spite of the constantly changing styles and tastes in teaching, 'Gilmour's *Bible History*' holds securely its position of universal preference. Only the excellence of the book can account for it . . ."

According to a letter by the Commission on American Citizenship of the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., to Dr. Willard Johnson of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Inc., "*The Gilmour Bible History still has considerable circulation, although it was first published in 1869.*"

WHO WILL CONTROL UNRRA?

By JOHN Y. FOSTER

—Will UNRRA be a smoke-screen for power politics?

THE ATLANTIC CHARTER, the Cairo and Teheran conferences and many public statements of British and American leaders have dealt with some of the principles on which the peace is to be built. There has been much talk of the rights of smaller nations, the right of people to self-determination and the organization of peace on an international basis. So far, most of this has been just talk; there has been an obvious desire to postpone debate on issues which might create disunity during the war.

But some suggestion of what lies ahead can be seen in the United Nations Relief & Rehabilitation Administration, in the record of its recent conference at Atlantic City and in the problems it now faces. Here, for the first time, the forty-three United and associated Nations and the French National Committee met, debated post-war questions, and established the first international machinery to come out of this war.

The fact that they met and established an organization is in itself promising. It is a step further than was taken after World War I. But for many people, of many nations, the outcome of the Atlantic City conference was a bitter disappointment. The step forward was clumsy and hesitant. It was far less than had been promised, far less than the victims of war have a right to expect. There has been a dangerous, possibly a disastrous defeat for the whole concept of international cooperation.

The problem faced by the Administration is essentially nothing more than an orderly distribution of scarce materials. Once Europe, or part of Europe, is occupied, there will be an immediate demand for supplies. First will be food,

clothing and medicines to meet emergency needs. Then agricultural supplies and industrial repair parts, fuel, transportation equipment, lumber, steel and hardware and similar materials necessary to get the economic machinery of a war-weary country rolling again. After that will be the need for machine tools, heavy machinery of all kinds, ships, and other goods which these countries will need to replace what has been lost or worn out during the war, to enable them to resume their place in world commerce.

There is a serious shortage of all these things. The United Nations are already in a deficit position on food. Most of our industrial machinery and a major part of our raw materials are being used for war purposes. The shortages will still exist in the first year after the war, the year in which there will be the greatest need in the occupied countries.

What will happen if there is no international management of relief and rehabilitation? The countries that are rich in supplies can use this power to enforce their political and economic aims in needy countries. Prices will be driven up in a mad scramble for goods. The European governments with foreign exchange (Belgium, Norway, Holland and France) will be able to buy; impoverished countries will go hungry. Relief will be used as a political weapon, not only by the supplying countries, but also by the governments-in-exile, many of whom know that they can assume power in their native lands only if they return with the promises of food—under their control.

There are a host of related problems—political, economic, religious, social and administrative—but the core is the single one of planned distribution. In

the original concept of UNRRA, the goal was simply stated: from each country in proportion to its ability to contribute money or goods; to each country according to its needs, without regard to ability to pay; UNRRA to be the clearing-house in which suppliers and recipients would have an equal voice.

The "UNRRA agreement" had been circulated among the principal countries early in 1943. The Conference itself had been planned for February, but disputes over its terms caused repeated postponements. When the delegates finally sat down at the U-shaped table in the Hotel Claridge in Atlantic City in November, the world situation had changed. Peace rumors were in the air. Many delegates felt that Germany's collapse was near. In this atmosphere, the unity and subordination of national interests compelled by the war had already begun to vanish. The Conference became a conflict of national interests and ambitions.

The result was diplomatic victory, of a kind, for the United States and the United Kingdom, as represented by Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, and Col. John L. Llewellyn, recently-appointed Minister of Food. It was an open secret that the United States and United Kingdom had come to the Conference prepared to dictate. For months the State Department had been conferring with British officials on the powers and duties of UNRRA. What was less generally known was that they had arrived at a secret written agreement, covering all points of possible controversy, and defining the position which the United States and United Kingdom would jointly defend.

For a full year the position of the United States had been in doubt. Former Governor Herbert H. Lehman of New York had been appointed head of the Office of Foreign Relief & Rehabilitation Operations, within the State Depart-

ment. He had assembled a staff which, with a few notable exceptions, was generally progressive and international-minded, though inexperienced both technically and in foreign relations. It was understood that OFRRO was beginning the work that UNRRA would some day take over. OFRRO's plans had more of an international flavor than would usually be expected of a national agency.

But OFRRO was never allowed to function. Once Lehman announced what he understood to be his charter of authority, the battle of the bureaus began. After the State, Treasury and War Departments, the War Production Board, the War Food Administration and the Office of Lend Lease Administration had finished with him, Lehman was left with an inadequate staff in crowded offices, thirty men in North Africa waiting month after month for the Army's permission to begin relief operations, a sheaf of unfilled requisitions and the bitter knowledge that the United States was not prepared to do its part in post-war relief. The food, agricultural machinery, hand tools, clothing, shoes and other supplies which should have been bought and accumulated gradually over 1943 had not been bought. If Germany should collapse in the Spring of 1944, the United States would not be ready. For want of agricultural materials, a crop year might be lost—just as a large part of the 1943 crop had been lost in North Africa.

To Lehman's staff, UNRRA seemed the only possible answer to an otherwise hopeless situation. For weeks before the Atlantic City meeting they worked day and night, preparing informational documents for use of the delegates. These documents covered the whole range of relief and rehabilitation problems, and provided a mass of background material on European and Asiatic requirements,

on supply problems and other matters. It was hoped that the United States delegation to the Conference would study these well in advance, and that the United States' positions on these questions would be worked out cooperatively. The several hundred documents were reproduced, assembled, carefully indexed and kept in readiness.

But, as usual, Lehman and the State Department were working at cross purposes. At the last minute, the State Department named the United States delegation. There was one United States spokesman, Dean Acheson. The State Department had its own documents, worked out in advance in consultation with the British. OFRRO's documents, and the views they expressed, were filed and forgotten.

America and Britain had prepared carefully, because controversy had been expected. Several of the European and South American nations, as well as Australia, New Zealand and Canada, feared that the Anglo-American Combined Boards (NOTE: Combined Food Board, Combined Shipping Adjustment Board, Combined Raw Materials Board, Combined Production & Resources Board), set up in war-time to pool British and American resources, would be continued in an effort to establish a British-American monopoly of supplies and shipping. Nations without foreign exchange feared that they would have less influence than those with funds. Norway feared that Britain would insist that Norwegian funds, on deposit in the United Kingdom, be used to pay for relief goods instead of new ships (these funds are chiefly insurance payments on sunken Norwegian merchantmen); thus Britain would be able to grab Norway's former share of the shipping business.

But Acheson and Llewellyn kept the delegates well in hand. Experienced dip-

lomats gasped at the audacity and arrogance of the British-American combination. Foreign delegates commented ruefully that there had never been anything like it in the history of international conferences. Openly, or through foreign delegates impressed into their service, they ran the conference, naming committee chairmen, prescribing the agenda of each committee, insisting that their prearranged decisions be adopted by committees. When, late in the conference, Llewellyn, on his own authority, announced that the question of India was "out of order," there was no voice raised in protest.

Only a few times did open dissent appear. Whenever it seemed likely to get out of hand, the subject was tabled quickly. By the time the next session came around, the protestants were chastened and silent.

The power of the British-American combination was understandable, their policies equally so. During the war they have established a virtual monopoly of supplies and shipping. They are richest in foreign exchange, and have frozen the funds of many other countries. Together they have power that will be nearly irresistible in the peace negotiations. They propose to keep that power intact until the show-down, the period in which the major post-war political and economic decisions are made. There was nothing in the relief conference worth bargaining for, nothing they wanted worth yielding one jot of their power.

The weakness of the governments-in-exile was also understandable. They are not really governments, merely groups of exiles who enjoy the status of governments because they have been recognized by the United States and United Kingdom and are allowed to draw on frozen funds. They know they exist as governments only on tolerance. They

know that their chief hope of returning to power rests on British-American willingness to support them, arm them with food and other supplies, provide them with credits and, if necessary, use military police power to suppress opposition movements.

These governments-in-exile would like to have now, under their immediate control, huge supplies of goods for relief and rehabilitation. Unable to get these, they have consented to participation in a general pool. But all have insisted that they and they alone must have complete and absolute control over the disposition of goods within their home territories.

The South Americans were silent, too, sensitive to British-American purchasing power and shipping control. Then too, it would be bad business to risk antagonizing the Conference chairman, Acheson, with whom they must deal daily in the State Department on a hundred other matters. The Russians arrived late, worked hard to familiarize themselves with every aspect of Conference negotiations, but sat silent in all but a few meetings.

Thus there was no one to speak for internationalism. The supplying countries would have welcomed internationalization of distribution; the recipient countries would have welcomed internationalization of supply. Both were sacrificed, because each group prized more highly its own national powers.

The Conference was a step forward, but a timid, faltering, wholly inadequate step. UNRRA exists as a skeleton, but it lacks blood and sinew. It is an international organization, but the power remains in national hands. Countries that want to buy supplies will go directly to the supplying countries and make their purchases; UNRRA will be informed, and may "object" if any one

country appears to be getting more than its share, but it will make its objection to the Anglo-American Boards. When UNRRA itself needs supplies for relief, it must ask for them from the Boards—an international organization of 44 countries subordinating itself to an organization of two of its members! UNRRA will receive contributions of foreign exchange from member countries, but it can spend these funds only with the prior approval of the donor country. UNRRA may aid in relocating displaced persons, but must first negotiate for the consent of the country where they are and the country to which they wish to go. UNRRA can purchase supplies in any country only after seeking the approval of the government of that country. To summarize, there is almost nothing that UNRRA is empowered to do, except to ask various countries for permission to do things. It is less an organization than a means of international negotiation.

And while UNRRA will have a large staff, presumably international in composition, the duties of this staff are still vague, for it is provided in the Agreement and in various resolutions that UNRRA shall not undertake to do anything which can be done by an agency of any member government.

Lehman's attitude and position was curious before and during the Conference, even more so since its adjournment. He was elected Director General unanimously. No matter how handicapped he may be by non-cooperation of supplying or recipient countries, in the public eye he will be held accountable for the success or failure of UNRRA in staving off famine and disease in liberated countries. Few doubt his sincerity. No one believes he will willingly let UNRRA be used as a political instrument. He is certainly no tool of the State Department.

Yet the events since the Conference raise serious questions as to the kind of Administration he plans to set up. Prior to the Conference, Lehman's own organization, OFRRO, was seething with internal unrest. Administration was chaotic, policies foggy, the future uncertain. Among top officials, a split between liberals and reactionaries had approached the proportions of a civil war.

Lehman ignored this for months, apparently believing that the advent of UNRRA would provide an automatic solution. Washington gossip columns needled him with frequent reports of resignations of various officials, including Lehman himself, but he refused to try to untangle the OFRRO situation.

Prior to the Conference, Lehman could, of course, make no decisions as to the staff of UNRRA. Weeks after his election as Director General he had made no announcement of any appointments. But there had been a significant and disturbing settlement of the controversy within OFRRO.

The attack of the liberals had centered on the leader of the reactionary bloc, a young social worker from New York, Hugh Jackson. In New York, Jackson had worked with public and private relief agencies, for a time working under one of Herbert Hoover's aides in European relief after the last war. He came to Washington as a second-line official in the Office of Civilian Defense, where he also incurred the enmity of the progressive and liberal element. Lehman made him his special assistant, and last Spring took him along on a trip to London. Jackson's Journal of that trip reveals clearly how he came under the influence of the more reactionary British leaders, with whom he has worked closely ever since.

After the Conference, Jackson emerged as the principal advisor to the

newly-elected Director General, wielding a powerful influence in all decisions as to personnel and administration. Simultaneously the three principal leaders of the liberal group handed in their resignations. They were: Phillip Jessup of Columbia University, noted international lawyer; Murray Latimer, Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, who had been serving as Lehman's Executive Officer; and Myres McDougall, General Counsel. Most of the lesser figures in the liberal group have resigned, have been ousted or have been moved into inconspicuous positions.

Thus, at the very outset, UNRRA has been given a weak charter of authority, and has lost the leaders who have fought hardest and most effectively to make it a stronger instrument. With reports of an early European invasion current, UNRRA has gotten off to a late start. As yet, UNRRA has no funds, no staff, no supplies and no plans for action.

The situation presents two principal dangers. One is the obvious danger of failure — too little, too late. United Nations propaganda has throughout the war been promising the people of Europe food and clothing when they are freed from Nazi domination. If, as is quite possible, the effect of invasion is to reduce rather than improve the standard of living, the political consequences may be grave, and the risk of considerable starvation and disease equally so.

The second danger is that UNRRA may be used simply as a smoke-screen, behind which power politics go on as usual—that relief may again be used as a political weapon, that hungry people may be fed only if they accept the government approved by the feeders. This may not happen, but within the present framework of UNRRA, it can happen.

A PRAYER

By W. ELLIS DAVIES

O GOD who art forever laboring in the unending ascent of life, save us from idleness, for to be idle is to frustrate life's grand fulfilment.

God save us from idleness and bless the work of our hands; yea! the work of our hands, bless thou it.

O GOD who art forever reviving hope within the human breast, save us from weariness, for to be weary is to abandon the high enthusiasms which make life thrill and throb and quiver with the excitement of a high ideal to be achieved.

Save us from weariness; let us mount up with wings as eagles; let us run and not be weary; let us walk and not faint.

O GOD who art the ever-returning light which melts away all gloom, save us from living in darkness; for to live in darkness is to turn away from knowledge and the search for truth; save us from darkness for to live in darkness is to live with ignorance and to abandon the magnificent adventure in which man unfolds life's great mysteries and approaches the divine.

Save us, O Eternal Spirit, from darkness and let our light so shine before men that they may see our good works and glorify thy name.

O GOD who art eternally patient and forever undaunted by life's slow ascent toward the divine, save us from fear; for to be afraid is to live in the shadow of death with spirit cramped and energies shrivelled; save us from fear, for by being fearful we corrupt our zeal and shrink from adventure and enclose ourselves within prison walls that shut out the challenge which brings vitality to our spirits and strength to our hands.

O God who art the pulsating life of our spirits, let not our hearts be troubled, neither let them be afraid.

O GOD whom Jesus taught us to call Father, save us from hate; for to be vindictive is to nurture fatal germs within our spirits; to live with hatred in our hearts is to becloud our minds with fever; save us from the cruel fire of hate, O God, for to live with hate is to recreate within ourselves the image of the enemy.

Let us remember Jesus who loved his enemies and blessed them that cursed him and prayed for those who spitefully used him.

O GOD, the inspiration of the man who could die forgiving his murderers, inspire us and save us from all evil by implanting and nurturing the seeds of love within our hearts.

Teach us and train us and help us to gain mastery over our passions so that, when the race is no longer to the swift and the battle to the ruthless strong—when man is tired and weary and disgusted with his costly folly—we may come with feet beautiful upon the mountains to bring tidings of great peace.

HELP US, O Divine Love of the Ages, to prepare ourselves to create thy Kingdom in which swords shall be beaten into ploughshares and spears into pruning hooks, and in which men shall learn of war no more.

Teach us and prepare us, O God, to plant in this world thy garden, which, nurtured under the sunshine of love and watered with the rain of tenderness, shall save all men from want. Teach us and inspire us to create a world in which idleness and weariness, darkness and fear and hate shall be done away, and in which hope and faith and love shall prevail.

So inspire us that we shall bring closer the day when the meek shall inherit the earth. *Amen.*

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Soldiers, Chaplains, Ministers, thank you!

You are doing great constructive work.

Enclosed find a little help toward the expenses of the work.

Thanking you for the courageous PROTESTANT and praying God's blessing on you and your work, I am

V. PRODAN

Glen Ridge, N. J.

I have read THE PROTESTANT with interest during the recent months and with growing appreciation of the service which you are rendering to our country and to the Church. I sent in my subscription some months ago. Responding to the presentation in your letter, I am enclosing a contribution to the cause represented by THE PROTESTANT.

J. EARL MORELAND, *President*

Randolph-Macon College

Ashland, Va.

I am enclosing the card indicating my desire to be present at the luncheon meeting of THE PROTESTANT on next Monday afternoon and I am also enclosing a small check indicating something of our interest in the work of your magazine. We wish it could have been much more.

EDLER G. HAWKINS

Minister, St. Augustine Presbyterian Church

New York City

Enclosed please find a contribution from the People's Church of Detroit. We feel that this is a mere token expression of our appreciation of the very progressive and dynamic contribution you are making through the pages of your magazine.

JOHN M. MILES, *Minister*

VIRGIL VANDERBURG, Associate

Your magazine is the only one I know that can both express the spirit of Protestantism and provide us with an intelligent, moral understanding of our place in history.

CHAPLAIN FERDINAND J. DENBEAUX

Camp Van Dorn, Miss.

Many thanks, and may God speed you in the fine work you are doing.

JOHN D. BARBEE, *Capt. CH C, Base Chaplain*

Barksdale Field, La.

I cannot tell you how very stimulating THE PROTESTANT is and how badly it is needed to buck up our Protestant Chaplains. At a Preaching Mission this past week at Camp Wallace I quoted from the last two issues, and in each instance the Chaplains were most anxious to receive copies.

REV. GORDON M. REESE, *Executive Secretary*

Army and Navy Commission of the Episcopal Church

Diocese of Texas

Enclosed is a check in response to your request for support. I wish it could be many times this amount, for my examination of your magazine shows it to be the type of a publication that is vitally needed today.

LOREN LEA STANTON, *Chaplain, U. S. A.*

Fort Lewis, Washington

I like your magazine and I like what you are promoting in connection with it.

LAWRENCE M. UPTON, *Chaplain*
Augusta, Ga.

When the copies of the November number of THE PROTESTANT arrived last week, the chaplains and some of the cadets, were practically waiting for them to arrive. Chaplain H— tells me that he is especially interested in the series of articles on the Cartels. Chaplain J—, in the Base Hospital, took two copies with him for the hospital reading room. A copy is always placed in the Post Library, and the remaining copies go to the chaplain of Wing 1 and Wing 2. With the increased interest in THE PROTESTANT, on the part of chaplains as well as cadets, I shall need at least twenty (20) copies of the forthcoming issue.

J. MITCHELL PILCHER (B.D.)
Chaplain Downing-Shofner for Girls
Maxwell Field, Alabama

I am enclosing a contribution to your fund for the fight against anti-Semitism. This contribution represents an offer from a few colleagues and fellow-soldiers and myself, Gentile and Hebrew, who feel your efforts make this war worth fighting and gives us courage and faith to know such militant decency is on our side.

PFC. G. S.
New York City

I leave for overseas duty and I can think of no other morale lifter than the knowledge that your wonderful organization is carrying on its excellent fight. America needs you and will need you all the more even after Fascism will be exterminated abroad—I dread a resurgence here.

CPL. F. R.
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Religion in Russia

Your editorial on Russia's Religion was certainly bold and courageous and far-reaching. It opened new vistas in our religious understanding of the Soviet Union, especially when you write: "Out of the Soviet system, a system within which many nations and individuals live under new economic forms in unprecedented creative community, there will arise new conceptions of the Ultimate."

As you say, "this orientation may or may not include an idea of God" and "for a while it will not, because the idea of God has got in the way of the actuality of God for so long in Western civilization that it will be regarded with suspicion. It may never return in the form we are used to."

I have thought on this problem for some time, and it may be that John Lewis in his chapter "Communism the heir to the Christian tradition" in *Christianity and the Social Revolution* has shed much light on the question of reference to the Ultimate:

"Eckhart . . . dissolved the idea of a separate transcendent Deity into the conception of the potentiality of being, rather after the fashion of Whitehead. God is unknowable only because all the potentialities of life are not yet realized. *There is nothing more Divine than the human soul.* Is this materialism of the Marxist type? If we remember that Marxism never attempts to reduce spirit to matter, but, on the contrary, declares that spiritual activities are the highest functions of matter, we shall see how near the great mystic is to the secularism of Communism." (p. 500).

In other words, a mystical approach to life as interpreted by the philosophy of dialectical materialism, in which man is part of a cosmic evolutionary process which enriches him and to which he can contribute, may become the religious orientation of the Soviet Union. And we are blind if we think that our theological or metaphysical categories give us the inside track to the Ultimate, as if social facts involving millions of people did not have a weight of their own! It is on the battlefields of the present war that faulty metaphysics have their backs broken!

ALFRED STIERNOTTE,
Vancouver, B. C.

Letter from Ludwig

In your December issue you published an article about me in which Mr. Franz Schoenberger expounds his ideas on my person, my books and political aims. I am not in the least interested in his ideas, but he adds a calumny. I beg to insert the following answer.

Mr. Schoenberger writes: "Mr. Ludwig . . . explained why it was all right for his old admirer Musso . . . to kill off with bombs and poison but without warning some hundred thousand black-skinned and unarmed people . . . The point was that slavery was not entirely abolished in Ethiopia . . . and for this reason Musso, by his slightly surprising action, represented a superior and even more Christian culture."

The whole quotation is an invention. I wrote the contrary in different articles and called Mussolini's aggression a crime. But as I had studied Ethiopia three years before that war in a Safari through wild regions of the country, I could compare the reality with the reports given by the Negus to the League of Nations. As I found that his reactions to the League were a camouflage, hiding the fact that slavery in his country had not even abolished to one per cent, I called him a liar and slave-holder who was in no way superior to the former Italian dictator. Mussolini's crime was not lessened by the fact that the leader of the violated country was a criminal himself. But neither did this leader become an honest man because he was attacked in a shameful way.

EMIL LUDWIG.

[Mr. Ludwig here confirms the main point of Mr. Schoenberger's "calumny": that Mr. Ludwig attacked the Negus for not having abolished slavery. This kind of attack was Mussolini's official line of defense during the whole affair. We should be glad to see the quotation from Mr. Ludwig in which he says he called Mussolini's aggression a crime. However, only a lawyer for the defense uses the stratagem of admitting murder committed by his client but then going on to expand in great length on the disgusting character of the victim.—THE EDITOR.]

A corporal writes

As a token of my appreciation of the splendid work you are doing, I am enclosing herewith a contribution to your Textbook Fund.

I want you to know that I have always admired THE PROTESTANT for its forthright articles and hard-hitting principles.

Indeed, they are much closer to what the residents of North Africa feel, than is the present Allied policy of dealing with the Girauds and Badoglio's, who are nothing but opportunist Fascist politicians.

I've often wondered what the men in the front lines think after "deals" are made with the same gang of men against whom they have risked their lives.

CPL. S.
Sicily

Suggestion for taxation

I believe you might help save this country from a trillion-dollar depression if you would advocate a heavily-graduated tax on *idle capital*—which is the same as saying *idle buying power*.

Statistics show that in 1930 total bank deposits in the United States were nineteen billion dollars *more* than at the close of any preceding fiscal year. (See World Almanac for 1936, page 289.)

To whom did these surplus billions belong—at a period when you and I were compelled to draw savings out, in order to keep alive? Obviously these funds must have belonged to a very few wealthy persons. And likely these billions were the proceeds of the hundred million shares or so of stocks unloaded on the public in 1929 at "boom" prices. Cash that was being held out of circulation (until 1932 for the most part) awaiting "bargain" prices before re-investment.

If so, certainly the bargains materialized. For the same stocks which in 1929 sold at more than \$300 per share could be re-purchased in '32 for less than \$50 per share—and unloaded again in '37 at higher than \$150. (See records of the Dow, Jones Averages, published by *Barron's Financial Weekly*, New York City.)

Moreover, after re-purchase for about three billion dollars of the same stocks that were unloaded in '29 for twenty billions, the seventeen billions of remaining profits could, in '32 and '33, have been invested in distressed or foreclosed mortgages or apartment and office buildings, etc., at less than half the real value of the properties.

Thomas R. Amlie says that Big Business men deliberately *desire* to see, after the War, an army of ten million unemployed in this country—for purposes of their own. Might it not be also that a few multi-millionaires would like to reap the billions of profits (to them personally) that might be gleaned through planfully creating and manipulating another depression?

Suppose, however, that in 1930 there had been laws providing that on all large sums of buying power held idly in "liquid" form for six months or longer heavy taxes should be levied. Would those billions have remained out of circulation until prices of stocks, real estate, etc., touched "bottom"? Or would this cash have been quickly re-invested—thus averting a ten-year depression and "recession"?

And how much more just to tax, first of all, the idle wealth that is tending to *cause* depression, rather than burdensome levies (especially in the low brackets) on persons engaged in production, or in spending and consuming, who are thereby tending to *alleviate* depression? The tax on idle buying power, I might suggest, should not touch sums of less than, say \$5,000—but from \$10,000 upward should be heavily graduated upward. Depression is not caused by the savings of the poor or lower middle classes, because for every billion dollars saved by that class for future spending other individuals of the same class spend a billion dollars of *prospective* earnings by buying consumable commodities or homes on instalments.

Why not advocate that workers, farmers, professional and business persons and productive or useful capitalists of this country *unite* to demand continuous prosperity and full employment by taxing out of existence the one thing which, more than anything else, tends to create depression—the withholding from circulation of large sums of *idle buying power*?

HARRY E. BURKHART
Brooklyn, N. Y.

New reader

As a new reader of your magazine I seem to be getting what I have craved, in a search for the causes of the manifold happenings in a world of business and politics. If you can gain the confidence of those who have long looked for a Christian application of affairs as we find them, you should find a following that will give you leadership.

Your article in the November issue on "What Does the Workingman Expect of the Church" was a bold statement of fact. We have witnessed the inroads upon the influence of the church, due to money influences, so that we had about lost faith in the organized church to light the way out of a troubled world. Sometimes in our efforts to make ourselves understood, we have been accused of attacking the church, or rather religion. No it is not intended to attack religion, only we attack the lack of it in application to trends that bid fair to destroy it.

WM. A. BALDWIN
Joliet, Illinois

The only hope

As an American and a Jew, I want to commend you for the brave and intelligent work you are doing. It is one of the most encouraging efforts on the part of our Christian brothers to get at the root of anti-Semitism.

The only hope for the Jew lies in an effort such as yours, expanded throughout the world so that no matter where a Jew lives he will live among friends and in peace.

MILTON B. ROSENBERG
Passaic, N. J.

A REVIEW OF VITAL LITERATURE

SEEDS OF THE FUTURE

As early as the Autumn of 1940, there were three underground newspapers circulating through France. It is not possible, yet, to tell the story of how and by whom these newspapers were brought to life. The sheets were printed in cellars, in barns, in back rooms, carried in ordinary bundles and brought from neighbor to neighbor, into homes, factories and offices. The chances taken by these unconquered citizens of France were tremendous, and many paid with their lives. This started three years ago; today there are more than seventy papers, circulating almost regularly all over the silenced jail that was once happy France; these seventy papers agglomerated a total of about 800,000 copies printed in the month of July of this year.

I have seen a handbag craftily made by a friend of mine; she was a shy looking, slim woman, a teacher, and her bag was a huge thing, apparently intended to carry composition books as well as ration point cards. Yet, it also concealed a very ingeniously hidden pocket, where she used to carry underground documents from place to place, from one underground agent to the other. Sometimes these agents were uniformed constables or railroad employees. But it is not my purpose to describe the ways and means of the French underground. It is not within the scope of this article to describe their numberless, spectacular performances of sabotage and rescue. I am concerned in this review with the underground press. Suffice it to say that these papers usually reach London through mysterious and undisclosed channels; when we receive them in America they are usually three months old.

They are full of facts—facts from the wide world, overheard through the radio; facts about the enemy; facts about France, her traitors and collaborators, her unflinching people, starved, enslaved, but determined and confident. A sort of unity of views has never ceased to prevail in those newspapers, and yet every one is different, shows a different trend. Some have evolved from faithful and respectful obedience to "le Maréchal," to a revengeful rebellion coupled with a constructive outlook on the future. This is, for instance, the case of the "*Mouvement de la Libération Fran-*

caise," one of the first and leading underground groups which organized a number of fearless newspapers.

The movement of resistance started in the autumn of 1940, with several underground papers. It was only a year later that its most important organ, *Combat*, was first published. *Combat* soon understood the fallacy of its respectful attitude toward Pétain, showing the evolution of public opinion. Later on, the hunted remnants of another group, "*Liberté*," joined *Combat*, and together they founded the "*Mouvement de Libération Nationale*." A special edition of *Combat* started publication in North Africa, as soon as the Anglo-American Forces arrived there. The followers of *Combat* are rather conservative republicans; some are former army officers; intellectually they are in line with the former *Esprit* Magazine published before the war by the Dominican scholars and their friends, all liberal Catholics. *Combat* is very extensively read by citizens of all parties.

Résistance is to be noticed for its excellent editorials on all main subjects. It has rejected the armistice with all its deadly implications, but believes that the Third Republic has not fallen undeservedly; it insists all leaders responsible for its collapse must be punished, and then France will regain her past greatness through a social and moral revolution in line with the principles of the Rights of Man.

The "*Volontaires de la Liberté*," a group of eager young men are in sympathy with *Résistance*, and want France to adopt entirely new political parties and personnel. *Résistance* is a conservative rightist newspaper, undoubtedly nationalistic but devoted to the democratic expression of free individuals.

It believes that the greater role played by the Free French Forces as a part of the armies of the United Nations the greater the prospects for France to retain her place as a major Power. It recognizes, however, the necessity of international cooperation.

Le Populaire is the mouthpiece of the Socialist Party. It was first published in May 1942. The "*Committee for Socialist Action*" has also published a monthly bulletin *Socialisme et Liberté*, and has been

very influential among the peasants. It wholeheartedly cooperated with all Republican groups of resistance. This Committee was dissolved in March 1943, but the Socialist Party proper carries on. *Le Populaire* is published monthly; it has retained the title of the former daily whose chief editor was Leon Blum.

L'Humanité was the daily paper Jaurès had founded. A Communist newspaper since the beginning of the Third Internationale, it is now one of the most extensively read underground publications. In Paris the Communists also publish *La Voix de Paris*.

Libérer et Fédérer has ceased to exist since over one year; it was in favor of reconstructing France on the basis of a very revolutionary program, pro-Marxist although not communistic, and definitely internationalistic.

Libération is the paper of the labor unions of socialist workers, published every week in the German occupied zone. It issued a separate monthly edition in the unoccupied zone before November 1942. There are several other labor groups who also publish various papers, such as *L'Insurgé*, or *La Vie Ouvrière*, the latter openly communistic.

Lorraine is published in the east of France; it is deeply impressed by the valor of the Red Army; however it does not conceal its definitely anti-communistic trends.

Le Coq Enchaîné ("The Rooster in Chains") is a small paper violently anti-Vichy.

La Voix du Nord advocates non-political labor unions; it is published by bourgeois intellectuals, definitely republican, but by no means socialistic.

Libre France is a new publication headed by young intellectuals; only a few numbers have reached London as yet.

France d'Abord is the mouthpiece of the Guerrillas Committee ("Comité militaire des Francs-Tireurs et Partisans") mostly pre-occupied with military underground activities.

Le Franc-Tireur ("Sharp Shooter") is passionately Republican, in the "jacobin" manner. Published monthly, it is determined to fight every type of dictatorship and wants France to become again a great power with a strong overseas Empire. Very much in the same line are the smaller publications "93" (in commemoration of the most glorious year of the French Revolution) and *Le Père Duchesne* (after the

title of a paper published during the same period). These three newspapers always remind the reader of the revolutionary tradition of the XVIIIth century.

L'Université Libre avoids politics, its only aim being to liberate France with the cooperation of patriots of all shades.

Ive République was recently started, as a socialistic paper, as well as *Mouvement Ouvrier Français* (first number dated June 1943).

Les Informations Sociales tries to prepare the future generation of leaders for the labor unions and political parties in a liberated fatherland.

Les Cahiers du Témoignage Chrétien was first published in 1941. It groups together all Catholic elements which wish to liberate France. This publication is in line with the Dominican viewpoint, and is strongly anti-racist.

There has even been a paper published in a concentration camp; its title is *Le Patriote*.

These are only the publications whose circulation is most widespread and more or less regular. Sometimes it is impossible to print a number. Then again the Gestapo and French police frequently interfere with the distribution. There are scores of other papers. Some try to keep an intellectual following, such as *Le Médecin Français*, *l'Art Français*.

Combat, *Le Franc-Tireur*, *Socialisme et Liberté*, *Libération Libre France* are in favor of General de Gaulle; they signed with him an agreement in June 1942 by which they acknowledge de Gaulle as the chief of France's forces of liberation. This was done with the realization that in order to avoid chaos and civil war, a Government must be formed as soon as the Germans begin to retreat. De Gaulle has given sufficient proof that he understands the needs and wishes of the French people and is ready to respect them. "He is a symbol of the democratic restoration of the State," wrote *Le Populaire* (June 1942). "Unanimous France has chosen General de Gaulle as her war leader," states *Libération* (August 1942) and *Combat* at the same time adds: "de Gaulle believes in the republican ideals to which we are all deeply devoted. . . . The union of the French have so decided."

Thus for the first time in many years the French people have regained their unity. They have shown enough moral determination to make the British and American Governments revise their policy and accept the

fact that the leader of the Fighting French was to be recognized as the de facto head of all Frenchmen, united in their determination to fight the common foe. But this unity has not been attained without efforts.

It required many months to realize what the armistice, collaboration and the National Revolution really meant, although the prestige of the "Savior of Verdun" still clings to the imagination of not so few Frenchmen.

Then in February 1942 came the trials in Riom. So much had been said and written against the Third Republic, its corruption and inefficiency, that the public had accepted its downfall without much regret. Had not the defeat been the result of such poor methods of government? But in spite of a reenforced censorship the news spread. France heard of Léon Blum's scornful accusations of his accusers, of Daladier's defiance of his tormentors. France learned that she had been betrayed by officers of the armed forces, by businessmen in partnership with the enemy, by thinkers or writers who had been most advertised in a press that acclaimed the policy of collaboration.

The French were then able to trace the origin of their terrible misfortune. The traitors and their accomplices were all men who for over three generations had fought the republican tradition, had endeavored to kill the Republic with the help of Germany, as their forefathers had done during the Revolution, in the ranks of the "émigrés."

When they realized their Republic had been a victim, not a convicted culprit, their love for the Republic grew stronger. They did not bother to ask their neighbor *how* he loved the republican tradition, but only *if* he loved it. When every group of resistance began to publish its own newspaper, one after the other, the differences between these groups did not appear like barriers; the tradition deep in their minds saved them from a uniformity of thoughts that would have in fact brought them nearer not to liberty, but to the fascist pattern they were already fighting so desperately. They turned again towards the traditional ideologies of their surroundings and social class, and felt that they had to crush the enemy—both their enemies; the German invaders and the reactionary groups within their own nation.

A number of Catholics became more and more impressed by the liberal trend of the former followers of the Dominican publi-

cation *Esprit*, and by the Popular Democrats, the only party whose followers were implicitly Catholics, who had been republicans and liberals for a long time already, as well as by the Catholic Labor Unions.

Although quite a few of the bishops still support the Vichy regime, there were many humble priests and a vast majority of the Catholic rank and file who have repudiated the tradition of opposition to the Republic prevalent since 1870.

"The parties and groups are reforming themselves," states *Le Populaire* in February of this year; "they meet and confer, underground. These meetings help to find our common wishes little by little." A medical paper, *Le Médecin Français*, described very clearly last April, how such a unity can be attained: "When the priest and the schoolmaster, the physician and the mayor, when the former socialist and left republican, the former fascist and the communist, the believer and the atheist have fought in the same national committee of resistance against deportations and requisitions, given shelter and food to guerrilla fighters who refused forced labor in Germany, when they have faced the same dangers and felt the same joy whenever a success was won, then they all will know how to find the fairest solution of all problems, big and small, that will be facing the country."

Libération had already declared (August 1942) that "France has chosen to suffer rather than to accept shame" and *Libérer et Fédérer*, that "this war and defeat have broken many barriers which through a number of party misunderstandings had been erected between Frenchmen in the past." (September 1942.)

This unity has expressed itself in a very concrete manner: The various groups of resistance formed a sort of underground government which "proclaims its rights and responsibilities as the provisional instrument of the national sovereignty over the whole territory, in close cooperation with the French Committee of National Liberation" (in Algiers) "to inspire, coordinate and direct the fight of the French people." It is formed of 16 members. (a) Eight delegates of the Resistance Groups [2 for *Libération*, 1 for *Combat*, 1 for *Franc-Tireur*, 1 for *Resistance*, 3 for *Guerrillas et Partisans*], (b) Six delegates of each of the former parties (Communist, Socialist, Radical-Socialist, Popular Democrat, Alliance

Democratique, Republican Federation), (c) One delegate of the Federation of left-ist Labor Unions and one delegate of the Catholic Unions.

Under this committee there are more than 300,000 active members engaged in the various functions of the underground activities. Useless to state that when one such member is suspected by the Vichy police, he is immediately arrested, and we should remember that 55,000 French hostages have already been executed by the Germans.

Groups of resistance have been formed in most private and public administrations. The chiefs of these groups will take command at the moment the liberation comes. *La Voix du Nord* (February 1943) informs us that steps have already been taken to make sure the collaborators will be immediately replaced, according to files carefully maintained. As *Combat* puts it, (January 1943) "On the day of her liberation, France will ask of everyone: 'What have you done during the time of shame and misery?' Knowing the answer, France will then be able to select her representatives, without any consideration of social origin, party or creed." The first tendency of the liberated people will of course be to take revenge against the traitors and their accomplices. Already the legal mind of the French has been at work, and several legal definitions have been adopted: high treason will be the crime of all those who have helped the invader. Instructions have been issued to arrest immediately all suspects of this crime.

There have already been formed many "Communal Committees of Inquiry and Work," who will operate in their own city or village, in order to replace the municipal councils appointed by Vichy, and to detect the accomplices of the traitors. A basis for the new Constitution has been proposed and stands a good chance of being adopted; it is a modernized reedition of the Constitution of 1793. The power of government rests in a single Chamber elected by all citizens, male and female. In turn, the Chamber delegates various executive functions to some of its members.

The underground press in France is building a French nation that may again become the inspiration of human ideals and brotherhood.

FACTS AND FASCISM, by George Seldes. In Fact, Inc., New York, 286 pp., \$1.50.

George Seldes towers among American journalists like an oak tree among shrubbery. A highly talented newspaperman and brilliant researcher, he is an expert at obtaining, developing and presenting news of vital significance (witness the important exposés which appear week after week in his unique newsletter, *In Fact*). But he is far more than that. Seldes is a writer of consummate honesty and intense courage. At a time when the dishonesty of most of the press is a cynically accepted fact and well-known newspapermen shape their wares to meet the demands of the highest bidder, Seldes writes what he believes to be true, and only that. He is no man's lackey and he makes no compromise with principle. That's why he is always stepping on the sanctified, collective toes of high finance, the press, big business and the Church. That is the reason for the shameful fact that no mention of his books is ever made by the regular reviewers, whose harsh or honeyed words are all too often parcelled out in direct proportion to the advertising space bought by the publishers.

Facts and Fascism should be read by those interested in the roots of the present war, for that is really the subject of the book. It tells the sordid story of fascism, that medieval product of the twentieth century and treasured property of the blood-stained clique of finance-capitalists who have converted great sections of the world into a charnel house in order to satisfy their personal greed. Seldes lists the butchers who brought the modern techniques of production into the business of mass murder. He does a thorough job of stripping that wretched myth that big industrialists and financiers have suffered losses under fascism. In Germany the Krupps and the Stinneses, in Japan the Mitsuis and the Mitsubishiis, in Italy the Agnellis and the Donegananis—these and their fellows fattened on the starvation and impoverishment fascism brought to their own lands and on the dreadful misery of the foreign territories they conquered and gutted. Fascism was the weapon with which these millionaire-assassins bludgeoned the rising movements of the people, enslaved their bodies and their minds, and drove them relentlessly onto the slaughter heap of war. From the outset the fascist

readers were the bought puppets of the great corporations and cartels. *Vereinigte Stahlwerke* and *I. G. Farbenindustrie* footed the bills of Hitler's terror and planned the redivision of the world in order to expand their markets and multiply their profits. The pattern was identical in Italy and Japan. In exchange for the millions of marks, lira and yen they added to their pockets, the moneyed gentry of the Axis offered up the lives of millions of men, women and children.

But the phenomenon of fascism, Seldes emphasizes, is not indigenous only to the soil of Axis lands. It also has planted its roots in the United States. Seldes gives as an example the National Manufacturers Association, a society ruled by a cabal of multi-millionaires who wage total warfare against organized labor and the interests of the American people, using their own stormtroop organization of "gunmen, thugs, racketeers, gangsters and murderers"; their private propaganda ministry called the National Industrial Information Committee; and their hired agents in the Congress of the United States. There is also Henry Ford, that venerable patron of fascism at home and abroad, who has employed every fascist device—Jew-baiting, corruption, gangsterism, and murder—to maintain a terrorist dictatorship over his empire of one hundred thousand workers. There is Charles Lindbergh, that bloodless, carefully groomed candidate for the American fuhrership. And there are the immensely influential fascists in control of American newspapers. Just how influential they are is indicated by Seldes' observation that William Randolph Hearst, Captain Joseph M. Patterson, Colonel Robert R. McCormick, and Roy Howard "put out one fourth of all the newspapers sold daily on our streets, they own forty of the 200 big city papers which make American public opinion, they run not only the three biggest newspaper chains in the country, but two of the three big news services which supply news to a majority of America's dailies." Seldes concludes his book with the comment that the inevitable victory of the United Nations over the Axis "must cheer all of us on to fight the remaining enemies of a free people at home."

In spite of the impressive array of facts that Seldes has recorded in *Facts and Fascism*, there are a number of unfortunate omissions. In his analysis of fascism in

America, Seldes fails to describe the intensive, far-reaching efforts of the Axis to build a fifth column in this country, to undermine American morale and sabotage our war effort. He says nothing about the America First Committee, which at the time of Pearl Harbor had become a fascist party of ominous proportions and which, despite its official liquidation, is still secretly functioning. He omits mention of the aid given native fascism by American Social-Democrats of the David Dubinsky brand, whose European prototypes played so vital a role in bringing Fascism to the Continent. And he offers far too meagre a treatment of the "anti-communist" facade behind which fascists in all lands seek to conceal their attacks on democracy, and of the gigantic campaign against the Soviet Union which right along has been the chief emphasis of international fascism and which still constitutes a major peril to the victory of the United Nations. Here Seldes might have taken a cue from President Roosevelt's address of December 15, 1941, which included this statement regarding the Anti-Comintern Pact: "This pact, as we all know, was nominally directed against the Soviet Union; but its real purpose was to form a league of fascism against the free world, particularly against Great Britain, France and the United States."

Perhaps the most important criticism to be made of *Facts and Fascism* is that it tends to an enumeration of facts rather than an evaluation of them. Not infrequently Seldes seems to take a quick superficial glance at the social phenomena with which he is dealing and not to be concerned with the complex forces and driving currents at work beneath the surface. Any thoughtful discussion of foreign or domestic Fascism must take into consideration the vast impact of this war and the deep, drastic changes it is forcing upon society as a whole.

But despite its several shortcomings, *Facts and Fascism* represents a valuable contribution to anti-fascist literature. That can be said of almost everything George Seldes writes. How many American writers can make a similar claim?

ALBERT E. KAHN

WHY WOMEN CRY — Wrenches by Elizabeth Hawes, Reynal & Hitchcock, Inc., New York, \$2.50.

When I went to school nobody ever told

me that if I worked hard enough I might become President of the United States. In spite of this, I was glad I was born a girl. After teen age I was hit in the pit of the stomach by so-called male supremacy and doubled up in doubt as to the extent I could equal a man. That's where I and millions of other women left off and Hawes' book begins.

There isn't a woman in the whole world who can't find herself some place in the beautifully designed pages of this little book. Her female classifications are volcanic. *Les Riches-Bitches*, *She Wolves*, *Equal-Righters*, *The Working Woman*, *The Contented Cows* and others. The *Rich-Bitches* are the lazy Fascists. If it means more servants and pastry for them, let Hitler come and rule us. The *Contented Cow* is relegated to the dusty shelves of mythology in a chapter of brutal hilarity. Thank God, there is no such woman who cheerily and happily cleans, cooks, budgets, takes care of the children, never gets a chance to go out, and "kisses her husband hello—or does not kiss him if he's not feeling that way."

She reaches deep into the heart and mind of each of us and promises with a feminine lustiness that we don't want or deserve a kitchen career or to be "tied to the home by a strong rope, the other end of which rests in the hands of a child, husband or servant." And, in turn, exacts the promise that no amount of power in a tug of war between the deadening, demoralizing activities of an undiluted home-life and that of a productive one in which the woman participates in contributing to the war effort, that the latter must emerge victorious if we are ever to reach the full stature of adult people and worthwhile citizens.

Miss Hawes' experiences in the Wright Plant gives us a step by step account of every obstacle the *Working Woman* will meet and how, blow by blow, she can and must remove it. She closes every avenue of defeat and opens the expansive territory of fighting on the basis of nursery schools for war-working mothers, after-school programs, unions, community kitchens for war-workers and much more. She never forgets to inspire us with the beauty of her machine; the joy of learning to control it and the creative satisfaction in discovering new methods of making it give more in efficiency and production.

And, above all, though it is a hilarious funny and witty book, it is dead serious in presenting a new kind of woman to the world; a woman who has no reason to cry who takes nothing away from the man but enriches his life by meeting him all the way on the economic, political, cultural and home fronts, and, "That females as well as males are human beings."

NANCY FENTON

THE LEGACY OF THE LIBERAL SPIRIT, by Fred G. Bratton, Scribners, New York, 319 pp., \$2.75.

RACE RIOT, by Alfred McClung Lee and Norman D. Humphrey, Dryden Press, New York, 143 pp., \$1.50.

THE PRINCIPLES OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS by Albert C. Knudson, Abingdon Cokesbury, New York, 314 pp., \$2.75.

The reviewer of books, like others, has his ups and downs. The latter are when he has to read dull and unimportant matter. The former are when he must treat the opposite — good substantial stuff. *The Legacy of the Liberal Spirit* is just that, it is meaty with abundant flavor. The author writes from a full mind, and a long historical perspective. Following the high way of liberal thought he sketches the chief figures that are the sign-posts of its progress. He does it with sure strokes, and with proper lights and shadows. Beginning with Origen of Alexandria he picks up Erasmus, Copernicus, Locke, Newton, Voltaire, Thomas Paine, Theodore Parker, Darwin, and John Dewey in turn. Of course Franklin and Jefferson have their place, although not special chapters. It is a brilliant line of monuments. Personalities who have led the world from static complacency and indolent ignorance to inspiring light and truth. The battle for liberalism has experienced various fortunes, but it has never ceased, and God grant that it never does.

Touching on the ecclesiastical aspects of the subject the author refers to the end of the last century when the Presbyterian Church deposed two of its best Old Testament scholars and the Methodists one, Charles A. Briggs, Henry Preserved Smith and Hinckley G. Mitchell. He might have recalled the amusing incident in that con-

roversy where a frightened, but zealous episcopalian bishop contributed the declaration that the doctrines of the Church were *rock crystal*. Not realizing that rock crystals are about the deadiest element known to man. The author states that: "The chief weakness of liberalism is lack of organization," and explains this by the fact that liberal-minded people are not easily regimented, for the genius of the free mind is independence. To that it might be added that should the Liberals become organized the result might be a sectarian crystallization; while the great function of liberalism is to be all pervasive, a leaven for the whole lump.

This book is such a summary as thoughtful students might well have close at hand for quick reference. It is to be hoped that ere long the author will exhibit more of his excellent wares. He has made a brilliant start.

Race Riot by Lee & Humphrey, professors in the department of sociology in Wayne University, and who were present throughout the recent Detroit race riots, should be required reading for every responsible American citizen. It is a book about the most inhuman, degrading, inexcusable shame. Shame in which every one of us is involved, and in a measure guilty. Complacency is perhaps our cardinal sin. It certainly accounts for our daily sin of omission. As long as we are not immediately affected our brethren may rot, and riot, and die as they did in the Christian, American city of Detroit. For while we are comfortably housed, clothed and fed we, like Gallio of old, care for none of these things. That the same and worse has not happened in Harlem, in Chicago, and other American cities is due more to the amazingly amiable, long suffering Negro than to any efforts of city, state or church to right the wrongs of racial injustice and inhumanity. But there is a limit; we cannot expect to continue free from the penalty of our habitual, daily sin of omission. We must awaken quickly and begin to be decent brotherly, Christian humans, or else?

Dean Knudson needs no introduction to readers and students of religion and ethics, this being his ninth book of scholarly substance. He handles the present subject with felicitous and authoritative ease. His careful, but courageous statements win

one's confidence. The first chapter is historical, academic, but thorough. He shows his practical wisdom in a footnote which says: "If the reader is not interested in the academic question with which this chapter deals, I suggest that he begin with Chapter II"; for which many readers will thank him. The rest of the book is plain travelling under this competent guide; short chapters, on subjects of daily human relations and experience. One sample must suffice: Often people are heard to say that they care not for creeds and have no church, that the Golden Rule is their religion. The author says: "The Golden Rule might be fully observed among sots and gluttons; do unto others as you *ought* to wish them to do unto yourself. The moral ideal must condition its application." Verbum sap.

CLIFTON MACON

THE BALTIC RIDDLE, by Gregory Meiksins, L. B. Fischer, New York, 271 pp., \$3.

"Many progressive intellectuals, well-meaning persons who can no longer be taken in by crude anti-Bolshevik slogans of Goebbels, continue to nibble at the Baltic bait. By cunning manoeuvres the wholesome sympathies that democratic circles have toward industrious and cultured small nations are transformed into violent anti-Soviet prejudices. A retinue of antiquated Baltic and Finnish diplomats serve as the transmission belt. The result is that the relations between the democracies and the U. S. S. R., the foundation of the new world equilibrium, are disturbed to the satisfaction of Germany and with invariably disastrous results for the small nations. A helpful fool is thrice an enemy"—writes Mr. Meiksins, a prominent Latvian lawyer and economist, a refugee living in this country.

Strange as it seems, the Baltic peoples have never lived under the delusion that they may ever become independent. During the twenty years of their so-called independence, first England and later Nazi-Germany had been constantly meddling into the affairs of these states. The British government through its financiers threatened them with a credit blockade in order to prevent them even from concluding a trade agreement with their neighbor, Soviet Russia, although the Baltic peoples had been fully aware of the fact that their fate was linked with that of Russia and that, if

their efforts to collaborate with that country were blocked, they would fall an easy prey to German imperialism and become again serfs of the German-Baltic barons. Faced with this alternative, the Baltic peoples had in the past been sympathetic toward the Russians and will, undoubtedly favor it in the future also.

Who is then claiming independence for the three small nations of the Baltic and why? As revealed by Mr. Meiksins' penetrating analysis, certainly not the peoples concerned. Anglo-French policy was responsible for it by attempting to create around Soviet Russia a "cordon sanitaire" of which the Baltic states would form an integral part. Corrupt Baltic politicians, a heritage from the chaotic conditions following the collapse of old Russia, served as "stooges" and endorsed Anglo-French policy wholeheartedly without taking into consideration the wishes of the people themselves.

After the first World War, American diplomacy was opposed to the creation of states incapable of existence merely in order to deprive Russia of her natural harbors which, moreover, might be used as potential bases in case of war against Russia.

At the present writing, it seems that German and anti-Soviet propaganda have succeeded in influencing the thinking of the general public in this country. There is a clamor for granting independence to the Baltic states although it is clear to everyone familiar with the true state of affairs in that part of the world that the independence of these countries can not possibly be maintained without fascist regimes. Thus, unwillingly, misled American public opinion is in favor of creating a Nazi outpost in the little known, complex Baltic world.

The reason for the success of this propaganda is the lack of any competent, unbiased treatise in English which would throw light on the intricate problems of these countries. The present book fills this gap. It is illuminating and, at the same time, easy and pleasant reading. It unfolds skilfully recent events, the taking possession of the Baltic states by Russia in 1940, and the subsequent occupation of these territories by the Nazis in 1941.

It is worth noting that the short-lived Soviet regime socialized only the biggest enterprises, whereas it left the small and

middle-sized plants and land in the hands of their owners. It was equally tactful toward religion and the Church also, and even granted land to the priests out of Church property. Under the Nazi occupation, Baltic barons regained their dominant position and the population was literally decimated and enslaved.

The chapter on the fourth, half-heartedly Baltic state, Finland, although extensively treated by others, gives an interesting insight into the peculiar social structure of this "brave little democracy."

NICHOLAS HALASZ

THE BAPTIST ROMANCE, by *Joseph Novotny, D.D.*, published by the Czechoslovak Baptist Convention in America and Canada, East Orange, N. J., 142 pp. \$.75

This is a romantic story indeed. Henry Novotny was born in the town of Resetov in East Bohemia which remained a hidden fortress of Protestantism even after the battle of White Mountain (1620) in which the Protestants were thoroughly beaten. History tells us that after that battle the Jesuits found in Resetov 48 "dangerous pismaks." Out of this tradition came Henry Novotny. What was a pismak? Simply a man who read the Bible. The trouble with these pismaks was that occasionally they got together in somebody's house and the authorities feared such gatherings. As a boy Henry Novotny saw Bibles burned in the chief square in front of the church. He also saw the pismaks suffer punishment by being beaten into unconsciousness. Readers of the Bible under the old Austrian regime had a hard time of it.

Henry Novotny started life as a Roman Catholic, but broke away early as a result of his experience with living remnants of the old biblical evangelical personal religion. He studied theology in Switzerland and in Edinburgh and was called by the American Congregationalists to Prague where he became the first Czech ordained Congregational minister. Later he became a Baptist and founded the first Baptist chapel in Czechoslovakia. Since the Baptist church was against the law it had no right to own property so they built this chapel in Novotny's garden, but the police entered the garden, carried the furnishings of the chapel outside, locked the door and announced that the chapel must not be used

anymore. Henry simply took the furniture into his own house and carried on there. There is an interesting chapter about Novotny's relation to Masaryk. They became life-long friends. When Masaryk entered the capital city of Czechoslovakia as its first president, the Baptists sought him out and presented him with an address composed by the author of this book. The great movement with the motto "away from Rome" that followed was partly the result of this intervention. That Henry Novotny was a real spiritual force cannot be doubted, and his son Joseph carries on in his footsteps. This book is a source book and should be on every minister's shelf.

K. L.

PRISONERS ALL, by Oskar Maria Graf, 442 pages, \$5.00.

More than 15 years ago the German author Oskar Maria Graf, a Bavarian by birth and temperament, published a book, "*Prisoners All*," which because of its frankness created a sensation throughout Germany. It was the story of a young man—obviously Graf himself—who went through the first World War and took part at the revolution of 1918 and its collapse. The extraordinary value of the book was its masterful characterization of the impressions and feelings of an average German towards the historical events in which he became involved. What are the German people really like; how does a German feel, think and act; how does a German revolution come about? Graf in his book, written long before Hitler came to power, has answered these questions far more convincingly than many analyses made by experts. For those who ponder about the future of Germany and about the chances of a true revolution of the German masses, the following paragraph of Graf's book should be of special interest:

"When the cry was: 'Down with war; no more militarism,' I was with them heart and soul, for that came home to me, I understood it, because I had hated it from my boyhood. I never could make sense of all the subsequent catchwords and phrases. I was one of the many millions who are only roused to activity when their own interest is at stake, who fight when they are forced to defend themselves, who only throw themselves into a struggle when they are conscious of a tangible meaning behind the

cause, in accordance with their own desires."

Those were the reactions of the common man in Germany of 1918. They will be the same this time and our anti-Hitler propaganda directed towards the German people should react accordingly.

"*Prisoners All*" was first published in the United States in 1928 but remained almost unnoticed. Too many people at that time thought that the German problem was settled for good. Today, we are approaching rapidly another 1918 and Graf's book has become a document of burning actuality. However, all efforts to find again a publisher failed. With the help of some friends, Graf put out his own edition on a subscription basis. Translation and make-up of the book are excellent. It can be ordered directly from Oskar Maria Graf, 34 Hillside Avenue, New York 34, N. Y.

H. P.

. . .

BOOKS RECEIVED

COME AND SEE, by Helen Allen, Association Press—Revell Co., \$1.25.

DO YOU KNOW YOUR BIBLE?, by Paul N. Elbin, Association Press—Revell Co., \$1.25.

THE PROBLEM OF PAIN, by C. S. Lewis, Macmillan Company, \$1.50.

THE DIVINE-HUMAN ENCOUNTER, by Emil Brunner, The Westminster Press, \$2.50.

REPORT ON INDIA, by T. A. Raman, Oxford Univ. Press, \$2.50.

A FIVE-YEAR PEACE PLAN, by Edward J. Byne, Coward-McCann, Inc., \$2.00.

REVELLE OR TAPS?, by Israel Gerstein, Bloch Publishing Co., \$2.25.

BRIDGE TO VICTORY, by Howard Handleman, Random House, \$2.00.

CHOOSE YE THIS DAY, by Elmer G. Homrighausen, The Westminster Press, \$1.50.

CONCERNS OF A WORLD CHURCH, by George Walker Buckner, Jr., The Bethany Press.

MAN THE MEASURE, by Erich Kahler, Pantheon Books, \$5.00.

NO NEWS FROM HELEN, by Louis Golding, Dial Press, \$2.50.

THE SNOWDEN DOUGLASS Sunday School Lessons 1944, by Earl L. Douglass, D.D., The Macmillan Company, \$1.50.

CHINA'S RELIGIOUS HERITAGE, by Y. C. Yang, Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, \$1.50.

OUR LADY, by Upton Sinclair, Murray & Gee, Inc., \$2.50.

THE RUNNING TIDE, by Irina Aleksander, Duell, Sloan & Pearce, Inc., \$2.50.

(Continued on Next Page)

BOOKS RECEIVED—Continued

ONE GOD—ONE WORLD, by Clarence Tucker Craig, Association Press—Fleming H. Revell Co., 75c.

GOD AND THE DAY'S WORK, by Robert Lowry Calhoun, Association Press — Fleming H. Revell Co., 75c.

TO GLORIFY GOD, by E. Fay Campbell, James H. Nichols and James P. Alter, Association Press—Fleming H. Revell Co., 75c.

GET TOGETHER, by Rachel Davis DuBois, Harper & Bros., \$1.75.

THE BROTHERS KARAMAZOV, by Fyodor Dostoyevsky, Modern Library, \$1.50.

ACTION THIS DAY, by Francis J. Spellman, Chas. Scribner's Sons, \$2.75.

JEW IN A GENTILE WORLD, by Isaac Graeber, Macmillan Company, \$4.00.

AMERICAN FREETHOUGHT, 1860-1914, by Sidney Warren, Columbia Univ. Press, \$3.25.

NO QUARTER, by Konstantin Simonov, L. B. Fischer Publishing Co., \$2.75.

THEY SHALL INHERIT THE EARTH, by Otto Zoff, The John Day Company, \$3.00.

THE DANUBE BASIN AND THE GERMAN ECONOMIC SPHERE, by Antonin Basch, Columbia University Press, \$3.50.

THE BEGINNING OF CHRISTIANITY, by Clarence Tucker Craig, Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, \$2.75.

RESTORATION PURITANISM, by Harry Grant Plum, The University of North Carolina Press, \$2.50.

A new novel by

Arthur Koestler

The author of *Darkness at Noon* and *Dialogue with Death* has written, "from the authority of his own experience," one of the most intense, absorbing, and completely unforgettable novels of recent years: a story of how men decide what they think is right, and why they are willing to die to back up their decision. "... it makes other novels that have come out of this war seem shallow," says Lewis Gannett in the *N. Y. Herald Tribune*, of

ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE

\$2.00

The Macmillan Company

60 Fifth Avenue New York 11, N. Y.

A STARTLING ANSWER TO THE QUESTION:

"What must
be done with
Germany after
the war?"

THE HIDDEN ENEMY

The German Threat to Post-War Peace

by HEINZ POL

author of *SUICIDE OF A DEMOCRACY*

TWICE in this century Germany has attacked the world. There is, therefore, no bigger problem today than how to make a third onslaught impossible. This book exposes the root of the evil and offers a practical solution.

HEINZ POL, former editor of Berlin daily *Vossische Zeitung*, was one of a valiant group of journalists who tried to warn the German people of the dangers of Nazism. He was arrested in 1933, the night of the Reichstag fire, and forced to flee to Czechoslovakia. His books were publicly burned by Goebbels. He escaped to France, where he witnessed the "collapse," and then went on to this country.

With a bibliography and index, \$3.00

Recommended by the Book-of-the-Month Club

On sale at all bookstores, or

JULIAN MESSNER INC., 8 W. 40 ST., N. Y.